

zation possibly more even than she knew, because the position which she held in it made her office a central bureau to which reports were made of the moral and intellectual signs of the times; and no man can read her annual messages to the organization of which she was the executive head without perceiving that she had a strong grasp of all the great social and moral problems of our time; a grasp so strong that to-day her words seem often like prophecies fulfilled, where twenty years ago they hardly attracted the attention of the world.

I think the highest point in the public career of the late Senator Hanna was that last speech of his before a meeting of laboring men and capitalists belonging to the Civic Federation in New York. When standing there, without any pretensions to piety or sanctity of any sort, he laid down the proposition, based on a long experience as a laborer and an employer, and on an intimate acquaintance with the leaders of political thought in all parties, that the rights of labor and the rights of capital can never be established on a lasting basis of justice except as both bow in loyal obedience to the law of Christ. Frances E. Willard had, for twenty years before her death, taught that doctrine, not only in its application to the labor question, but to all the complex social problems of these times.

Her chief title as a teacher of social and moral science lies in this: With a profound insight she perceived that the most difficult problems of civilization, the problems which have brought the statesmanship and philosophy of the modern world to a dead standstill, if they have any solution at all—and she confidently believed they had—they would find it at last in the actual application to the daily life of the world of the divine precepts which constitute the most precious part of the inheritance of these Christian centuries. [Applause in the galleries.]

And so I think that the general assembly of Illinois did well to set up this monument in memory of her. The children who have covered it this day with flowers have paid to her a tribute so simple and so appropriate that its fragrance will fill these corridors long after the formal ceremonies of this hour have been forgotten. And in after generations, as long as this venerable edifice remains, the women of America, as they look upon the chiseled beauty of that face, standing like a goddess among our heroes and our sages, will whisper a word of gratitude to the people of Illinois when they remember the act of her general assembly, which, careless alike of custom and of precedent, has added to the title of their citizenship this perpetual dignity in the Capitol of the United States. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], which will be read.

The Secretary again read the resolutions.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned its legislative session until to-morrow, Saturday, February 18, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 17, 1905.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee, O God, our Heavenly Father, for this day, which marks an epoch in the progress and civilization of our age and nation by the placing of the statue of a woman in this Capitol, among the noted and illustrious men of our nation, who, by the purity of her soul, the breadth and scope of her intellectual attainments, the eloquence and chastity of her speech, and her unselfish devotion to the purity of the home, the State, the nation, and humanity, won for herself the splendid and just encomium, "The uncrowned queen of purity and temperance." God grant that there it may stand instinct with life and vocal with its eloquent appeal "for God and home and native land;" there may it stand a beacon light for untold millions in their upward and onward march toward the ideals in Christian manhood and womanhood; and glory and praise be Thine, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### RESERVATION OF GALLERY.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following resolution be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

XXXIX—175

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the ceremonies incident to the acceptance of the statue of Frances E. Willard presented by the State of Illinois to the Government of the United States, on Friday, February 17, at 4 o'clock, the southeast ladies' gallery be reserved for the Illinois statutory commission and the relatives of the late Frances E. Willard and such citizens of Illinois as may attend these services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### STATEHOOD BILL.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

### House resolution No. 497.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Territories be, and hereby is, discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14749) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, with the Senate amendments thereto; that the said Senate amendments be, and hereby are, disagreed to by the House, and a conference asked of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the said bill.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution, and on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the previous question upon the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There is no discussion of a demand for the previous question, is there?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Would it be in order for me to say that the only way to get an opportunity to amend this rule is to vote down the previous question? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already made that suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Did the Chair understand my inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Chair replied. The gentleman has asked the question. It is not in order under the rules, but still the gentleman has answered his own question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I asked the question as to whether it would be in order.

The SPEAKER. Yes; the gentleman has the full benefit of it. [Laughter.] Pending a demand for the previous question nothing is in order except the vote on the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That was my own impression, but I wanted to be sure of it. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair is very glad to confirm the gentleman in the correctness of his impression. [Laughter.] The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 160, nays 127, answered "present" 7, not voting 90, as follows:

### YEAS—160.

Adams, Pa.	Dalzell	Hinshaw	Martin
Adams, Wis.	Daniels	Hitt	Miller
Alexander	Darragh	Hogg	Minor
Allen	Davis, Minn.	Howell, N. J.	Mondell
Ames	Dayton	Howell, Utah	Morgan
Babcock	Dixon	Huff	Morrell
Bartholdt	Douglas	Hughes, W. Va.	Mudd
Bates	Dovener	Hull	Murdoch
Pede	Draper	Humphrey, Wash.	Nevin
Beldier	Dresser	Hunter	Norris
Birdsall	Driscoll	Jenkins	Otjen
Bishop	Dunwell	Jones, Wash.	Overstreet
Boutell	Esch	Kennedy	Parker
Bowersock	Foss	Ketcham	Patterson, Pa.
Bradley	Foster, Vt.	Kinkaid	Payne
Brandegee	French	Knapp	Perkins
Brooks	Fuller	Knopf	Porter
Brown, Wis.	Gaines, W. Va.	Knowland	Powers, Me.
Brownlow	Gardner, Mass.	Kyle	Powers, Mass.
Burke	Gardner, N. J.	Lacey	Reader
Burkett	Gibson	Lafean	Roberts
Burleigh	Gillet, N. Y.	Landis, Frederick	Rodenberg
Burton	Gillett, Cal.	Lawrence	Scott
Butler, Pa.	Gillett, Mass.	Lilley	Sibley
Calderhead	Goebel	Littauer	Slomp
Campbell	Graff	Littlefield	Smith, Iowa
Capron	Greene	Longworth	Smith, Wm. Alden
Castor	Grosvenor	Loudenslager	Smith, N. Y.
Conner	Hamilton	Lovering	Smith, Pa.
Cooper, Pa.	Haskins	McCarthy	Snapp
Cromer	Haugen	McCreary, Pa.	Southard
Crumacker	Hemenway	McMorran	Southwick
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Mahon	Spalding
Curtis	Hepburn	Mann	Stafford
Cushman	Hill, Conn.	Marshall	Stevens, Minn.

Sulloway  
Tawney  
Thomas, Ohio  
Tirrell  
Townsend

Van Voorhis  
Volstead  
Vreeland  
Wachter  
Wadsworth

Wanger  
Warner  
Warnock  
Watson  
Webber

Weems  
Wiley, N. J.  
Wilson, Ill.  
Wood  
Young

## NAYS—127.

Adamson  
Badger  
Baker  
Bankhead  
Bartlett  
Bassett  
Beall, Tex.  
Bell, Cal.  
Benton  
Bowers  
Bowie  
Brantley  
Breazeale  
Brundidge  
Burgess  
Burleson  
Burnett  
Byrd  
Caldwell  
Cassingham  
Clayton  
Cochran, Mo.  
Cooper, Tex.  
Cowherd  
Croft  
Davey, La.  
Davis, Fla.  
De Armond  
Denny  
Dickerman  
Dougherty  
Field

Fihley  
Fitzgerald  
Flood  
Garber  
Gillespie  
Goldfogle  
Granger  
Gregg  
Gudger  
Hamlin  
Harrison  
Hay  
Heflin  
Henry, Tex.  
Houston  
Howard  
Hughes, N. J.  
Humphreys, Miss.  
Hunt  
James  
Jones, Va.  
Kitchen, Claude  
Kitchen, Wm. W.  
Kilne  
Klutz  
Lamar, Fla.  
Lamb  
Legare  
Lester  
Lever  
Lewis  
Lind

Little  
Livernash  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Lucking  
McLain  
McNary  
Macon  
Maddox  
Meyer, La.  
Miers, Ind.  
Moon, Tenn.  
Padgett  
Page  
Patterson, N. C.  
Pierce  
Pinckney  
Pou  
Pujo  
Ralney  
Randell, Tex.  
Reid  
Rhea  
Richardson, Ala.  
Rider  
Rixey  
Robb  
Robertson, La.  
Robinson, Ark.  
Robinson, Ind.  
Rucker  
Russell

Ryan  
Scudder  
Shackleford  
Sheppard  
Sherley  
Sims  
Slayden  
Small  
Smith, Tex.  
Snook  
Southall  
Sparkman  
Spight  
Stanley  
Stephens, Tex.  
Sullivan, Mass.  
Sulzer  
Talbot  
Thayer  
Thomas, N. C.  
Trimble  
Underwood  
Vandiver  
Van Duzer  
Wade  
Wallace  
Wiley, Ala.  
Williams, Ill.  
Williams, Miss.  
Wynn  
Zenor

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Bonyng  
Brick

Needham  
Prince

Shull  
Taylor

Woodyard

## NOT VOTING—90.

Acheson  
Aiken  
Benny  
Bingham  
Broussard  
Brown, Pa.  
Buckman  
Butler, Mo.  
Candler  
Cassel  
Clark  
Cockran, N. Y.  
Connell  
Cooper, Wis.  
Cousins  
Crowley  
Davidson  
Deemer  
Dinsmore  
Dwight  
Emerich  
Evans  
Fitzpatrick

Flack  
Fordney  
Foster, Ill.  
Fowler  
Galnes, Tenn.  
Gardner, Mich.  
Garner  
Gilbert  
Glass  
Gooch  
Goulden  
Griffith  
Griggs  
Hardwick  
Hearst  
Hedge  
Hermann  
Hildebrandt  
Hill, Miss.  
Hitchcock  
Holliday  
Hopkins  
Jackson, Md.

Jackson, Ohio  
Johnson  
Kehoe  
Kelher  
Lamar, Mo.  
Landis, Chas. B.  
Lindsay  
Lorimer  
Loud  
McAndrews  
McCall  
McCleary, Minn.  
McDermott  
McLachlan  
Marsh  
Maynard  
Moon, Pa.  
Olmsted  
Otis  
Palmer  
Patterson, Tenn.  
Pearre  
Ransdell, La.

Richardson, Tenn.  
Ruppert  
Scarborough  
Sherman  
Shiras  
Shober  
Smith, Ill.  
Smith, Ky.  
Smith, Samuel W.  
Sperry  
Steenerson  
Sterling  
Sullivan, N. Y.  
Swanson  
Tate  
Thomas, Iowa  
Webb  
Weisse  
Williamson  
Wilson, N. Y.  
Wright

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
For this vote:

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania with Mr. WEBB.  
Mr. HEDGE with Mr. TATE.  
Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota with Mr. AIKEN.  
Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. McDERMOTT.  
Mr. PRINCE with Mr. GRIFFITH.  
Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. GRIGGS.  
Mr. JACKSON of Maryland with Mr. DINSMORE.  
For this day:  
Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BENNY.  
Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee.  
Mr. BONYNGE with Mr. BROUSSARD.  
Mr. BUCKMAN with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.  
Mr. CONNELL with Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. SWANSON.  
Mr. COUSINS with Mr. CANDLER.  
Mr. DWIGHT with Mr. GOULDEN.  
Mr. EVANS with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.  
Mr. FLACK with Mr. EMERICH.  
Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. GILBERT.  
Mr. FOWLER with Mr. CROWLEY.  
Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. GLASS.  
Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. HITCHCOCK.  
Mr. JACKSON of Ohio with Mr. GARNER.  
Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS with Mr. CLARK.  
Mr. LOUD with Mr. HOPKINS.  
Mr. McCALL with Mr. KELIHER.  
Mr. McLACHLAN with Mr. JOHNSON.  
Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.  
Mr. OTIS with Mr. LAMAR of Missouri.  
Mr. SHIRAS with Mr. SHOBER.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. MAYNARD.  
Mr. THOMAS of Iowa with Mr. LINDSAY.  
Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. WEISSE.

For this session:

Mr. CASSEL with Mr. GOOCH.  
Mr. DEEMER with Mr. SHULL.  
Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.  
Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. HARDWICK.  
Until further notice:  
Mr. BRICK with Mr. COCKRAN of New York.  
Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.  
Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. TAYLOR.  
Mr. LORIMER with Mr. McANDREWS.  
Mr. MARSH with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.  
Mr. PALMER with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.  
Mr. PEARRE with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.  
Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. SCARBOROUGH.  
Mr. SPERRY with Mr. KEHOE.  
Mr. STERLING with Mr. WILSON of New York.  
Mr. BRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether Mr. COCKRAN of New York has voted?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. BRICK. Then I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded as present.

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called Mr. BRICK's name, and he answered "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is recognized for twenty minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall occupy the time of the House only long enough to explain the effect of this rule. If adopted it will discharge the Committee on Territories from the further consideration of what is known as the "statehood bill," will work a nonconcurrence in the Senate amendments in gross, and ask for a conference upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. Gentlemen of the House will recollect that in April last the House sent to the Senate a statehood bill which created two States out of the four Territories, Oklahoma and Indian Territory constituting one State and New Mexico and Arizona a second State. That bill has been in the Senate until within a few days. It now comes back to the House with forty-seven amendments. The principal amendment, of course, is that which constitutes New Mexico a State and leaves Arizona still a Territory. There is another important amendment which takes off a portion of Arizona and adds it to Utah. Now, these forty-seven amendments, under the rules of the House, would be debatable in Committee of the Whole, each amendment the subject of debate and each amendment the subject of amendment—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And vote.

Mr. DALZELL. Ad infinitum, and it is the judgment of the Committee on Rules that, considering the state of public business and the lateness of the session, it is desirable, if legislation is to be had upon this subject of statehood at all, to have this bill go as speedily as possible to conference. The House has expressed its judgment and the Senate has expressed its judgment, and if any agreement can be had at all it will be had in conference. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, the proposition to be brought before the House under this rule is a very important one, and upon this side of the House we think, as we have been accustomed to think for a long time, that the House ought to have some opportunity to consider amendments and to offer amendments and to vote upon amendments. If the rule be adopted, no such privilege as that will be accorded to us and no such right as that will be enjoyed by us.

We believe that these Territories ought to be admitted and ought to be admitted upon fair terms. We believe that Arizona and New Mexico ought to constitute two distinct States. We believe there well might be two States made out of Indian Territory and Oklahoma; but, whatever ought to be done, we believe that the House ought to have the opportunity to do it, and that the matter ought not to be determined in an arbitrary fashion under a rule which cuts off the House from an opportunity to express its own mind or to have its own will done.

Mr. Speaker, there are other gentlemen here who are much better acquainted with the question than I am and whose remarks upon the subject will be worth much more to the House



than any which I could make. Therefore, that some of them may be heard, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield it back to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a very unusual occurrence—that a committee that has the right to report to this House at this time under the rules of the House, a committee that has the highest possible privilege when it reports upon a statehood bill, should never have the opportunity to consider statehood legislation. It is a remarkable fact that this House should be called upon to pass upon a matter that affects forever the destiny of Arizona and New Mexico by uniting them when the people of both Arizona and New Mexico are in direct opposition to that which is attempted by Congress and when the majority of this House is opposed to that action. If the public press states the truth, there are thirty-three men on the majority side that have had to be coerced by rules and by leadership, and that actually to-day a majority of this body are in direct opposition to that which is attempted by a majority of the majority. I have not the time to call attention to the history of this very important legislation. On the 9th day of November, 1903, the Delegate from the Territory of New Mexico [Mr. RODEY] introduced a bill asking for statehood for New Mexico. On the 10th day of November, 1903, the Delegate from Arizona [Mr. WILSON], carrying out the wishes of his people, introduced a bill asking for statehood for Arizona. On the 18th of November the Delegate from Oklahoma [Mr. McGUIRE], representing, as he said, the interests of his people and their wishes, introduced a bill asking for separate statehood for Oklahoma. Later, on the 5th day of November, 1904, at the instance of certain citizens of Indian Territory, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], a member of the Committee on Territories, introduced a bill asking for statehood for the Indian Territory. Hearings were had before the Committee on Territories covering nearly two months. There are two volumes of those hearings, almost as large as this volume, the House Digest, and yet when that important bill, affecting for all time the interests of the four great Territories, was brought before this House, notwithstanding that kind of a bill has as much precedence, or ought to have, under the rules, as a report from the Committee on Rules itself, we were allowed three hours in which to discuss that bill. A special rule was brought in by the Committee on Rules saying that there should be three hours for debate, and that no amendment should be offered excepting two amendments which the Committee on Rules were concerned should become a part of the bill.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Under ordinary circumstances would my colleague [Mr. LLOYD] be in favor of simply concurring in the Senate amendments—

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir; I am not in favor—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The Senate bill containing, as it does, all these important provisions?

Mr. LLOYD. As far as I am concerned, I am not in favor of concurrence with the Senate.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. So my colleague [Mr. LLOYD] would be in favor of nonconcurrence? Is not that the motion before the House?

Mr. LLOYD. I am in favor of concurrence in part, and I am sure this side of the House is in favor of concurrence in part, but the remarkable fact is, the minority—those on this side of the aisle—have never been consulted at all, and this House, through its leadership, has sought for the last ten days to coerce the thirty-three men on the Republican side that were in sympathy with our views on statehood questions.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If I am correctly informed, the minority will have representation on the conference committee just the same as the majority, and if the majority takes the chances to send that bill to conference it seems to me that the minority can take the same chances, and that they are on an equality, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe the statement given out by the public press, the petition which you have signed, the statement signed by that side, by the majority, stands by the Hamilton bill. If that be true, then the minority of the majority nor any other minority will have any chance in the conference.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is not true, as far as I know.

Mr. LLOYD. The best confirmation of that will be to produce the petition.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The petition, as I understand it, which, by the way, I have not signed, but which has been signed by a number of Members of this House, simply provides that the

principle of two States instead of four will be maintained. That is all.

Mr. LLOYD. I did not suppose the gentleman from Missouri, my colleague, signed that statement, because I am sure he is not what is termed in the press "one of the recalcitrants."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is true.

Mr. LLOYD. But I am concerned to express this, that the people of Arizona want a State of their own; the people of New Mexico want a State with their present boundary. They are not coming here through any person whatever asking admission into the Union of those two Territories as one State. It is also a true statement that the people want two States down there instead of one. Why, the attempted action here is superseding the will of the people of those two Territories. I am concerned for statehood legislation. If there is any Territory that ever asked for admission into this Union that ought to be admitted, it is the Territory of Oklahoma to-day. Never in the history of this Republic has a Territory presented so strong a case as Oklahoma presents. The Indian Territory presents a pitiful condition. No Territory controlled by the United States Government has ever been in the unfortunate condition that the Indian Territory finds itself to-day. Something needs to be done. So far as I am concerned, I am anxious by legislation that they shall obtain relief. But I do not understand why it is that this House should be afraid of itself. In the last few days the Senate of the United States has seen fit to challenge the action of the President of the United States because he was undertaking something, as they thought, that was an infringement upon the rights of the Senate. This House on yesterday asserted its rights, as it ought to, by passing a resolution sending a bill back to the Senate and telling them that they could not trample upon the rights of this House. To-day we are faced with the proposition of coercing a minority of this House because the majority of it happened to be in power and have the power to do so.

I am concerned that statehood legislation shall have fair and thoughtful consideration. This bill went to the Senate on the 20th day of April, as I remember, last year. It did not come back to us until within the last ten days. The Senate gave it careful consideration. They considered every proposition and every amendment. They discussed them all, but you and the Members of this House have no opportunity to discuss an amendment in connection with this legislation. I am concerned that this body shall maintain its dignity; that it shall investigate the great questions that come before it—and no more important question has been before this body. The question now before it is whether four great Territories shall be admitted to statehood or not; and if so, upon what terms they shall be admitted.

I yield back the remainder of my time. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. How much time has been consumed on the other side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I do not know by what authority the gentleman from Missouri claims to speak for the minority of the Republican majority of this House or why he has been the special person designated to present to this House the wrongs of what he calls the "recalcitrants." I am not aware that there are thirty-three Republicans opposed to this legislation, as he asserts.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. LLOYD. Do you deny that there are thirty-three Republicans on that side of the House who are not in favor of the Hamilton bill?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I think I can deny it with perfect safety and with truth.

Mr. LLOYD. Then I would ask this question: If it is not true in the caucus which was recently held by your party there were thirty or thirty-five men against the decision which your party arrived at?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I do not understand that it is any part of my privilege or duty to state what took place in a caucus or conference.

Mr. LLOYD. I agree fully with that statement. I concede that.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. We did not have any caucus.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. We had nothing but a conference, and when we are discussing anything in a conference there



might naturally be some of us for one thing and some of us for another.

Mr. LLOYD. May I ask if the information is correct that thirty or thirty-five persons on that side were called on to sign a petition before this rule was brought in to get any action taken on the statehood bill?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. If there has been any such necessity as that it has been unknown to me. But I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I believe if the fair sentiments of the Democrats as well as of the Republicans of this House in reference to this bill could be expressed, if the Democratic Members of this House had not been bound by a caucus as they were in the last session—and I do not know but they have also been in this—and if they did not feel that party fealty required a united and solid Democratic opposition, I have no doubt that the bill called the "Hamilton bill" would prevail by a good majority.

Mr. WACHTER. Nobody was whipped into line.

Mr. LLOYD. I wish to say in reply to the gentleman from Maine that if both sides had had an opportunity to vote on this matter, without reference to the rules forced upon the minority, the Hamilton bill would never have been adopted by this House.

Mr. MARSHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. For a question.

Mr. MARSHALL. I should simply like to state, for the benefit of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], that I was one of those people to whom he refers, and as he seems to have an anxiety regarding them, I desire to relieve him of any further anxiety or responsibility, so far as I am concerned. [Laughter.]

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Besides, while I am favorable to legislation which shall give recognition to these Territories and make them States, yet I make this statement advisedly, after having carefully investigated the matter and after having been there personally: I do not believe that the present population or the future probabilities of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona are such as to entitle them to be admitted into the Union as two States. I never have believed that it could be done with justice to many of the other States of the Union, and in so stating I do not intend to cast any reflection upon the intelligence of the people of those Territories.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, in that connection, if the rule would permit us to vote on the union of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, I have no doubt that the gentleman and I would vote together, and that nearly every Member on the floor of this House, both Democrat and Republican, would vote for that proposition because of their anxiety for statehood.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Let me say one word more. The admission of these Territories as States is a Republican measure. The Republican Members of this House are responsible for the legislation of this House; and how much of truth there may be—I do not admit there is any—in the claim of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] that the joining of New Mexico and Arizona does violence to the wishes of the House as a whole, nobody can deny that a large majority of the Republicans, both of this House, of the Senate, and of the country, believe that but two States should be made of those Territories.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. How much time is remaining on the other side, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has eight minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has thirteen minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman use some more of his time?

Mr. DALZELL. There will be only one more speech over here, and that in conclusion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we have become so accustomed to drastic rules that I do not know that dwelling upon the degree to which they are drastic in any particular case does much good. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] says that the object of this rule is to get to an end with regard to this legislation as rapidly or speedily as possible. And yet it is self-evident to anyone who will take the trouble to think that if we had gone on operating under the rules of the House without this special rule, under the general rules which permit a motion to concur in whole or in part to have precedence over a motion to nonconcur and go to conference, we would reach a conclusion very much more speedily.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we desire to offer, and in the committee did offer, and here would offer, if this rule did not prevent it, an amendment to the rule itself providing that nothing contained in the rule should prevent recognition by the Speaker of any Member to move concurrence or partial concurrence in any part of these Senate amendments.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS] says he has no doubt that the Hamilton bill would be indorsed by a majority of this House and the Senate amendments would be voted down. And yet we are furnished with the spectacle of a majority of the majority, supposedly entertaining the views which the gentleman from Maine has uttered, absolutely refusing to permit a minority of the majority and the minority itself to have a vote upon the very amendments coming from the Senate which he says a majority of the House would not indorse.

It is clear to every man who knows this House that upon one point, at any rate, a majority of this House, including both sides of it, would concur with the Senate, and that would be with regard to so much of the Senate's action as keeps Arizona still a Territory rather than to unite her destiny and that of New Mexico forever, she protesting against surrendering her Territorial conditions for statehood, no matter how much she wants statehood, if that statehood is to come to her coupled with New Mexico. It is also not doubted that the sentiment of New Mexico is opposed to making one State of the two, and I challenge the gentleman now—I dare the majority of this House—to let us have a vote upon that question.

The gentleman tells us that there are not thirty-three men upon that side who have had to be whipped into concord.

I know nothing about it except what the public press has reported. It is reported that there were thirty-three of you, and that not even a rule would be submitted to this House until the majority of the majority had made those thirty-three men constituting the minority of the majority not only promise, but sign up a promise to support this rule. Ah, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to know just exactly who those men are. The public press this morning says that thirty out of the thirty-three have "signed up." I would give a penny to know who the three full-bloods are that are still off the reservation, the three blanket Indians. [Laughter.] The blanket Indians generally have come back, we hear. I have never seen a time in my life before when the majority of the majority was not willing to trust the minority of the majority on its verbal promise at any rate. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I have known them to coerce, but I never knew men to entertain such a poor opinion of one another when constituting a majority of this House as to refuse to take a verbal promise "to be good." [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Those who have had to sign up have had to do it in black and white; they have had to go down upon their knees, metaphorically speaking at any rate, and have had to append their names just where they were told to append them. Gentlemen, I do not know which to feel the most proud of as an American citizen—the majority of the majority who have hazed the minority of the majority, or the minority of the majority who have consented to be hazed, always, of course, with the exception of the three noble full-bloods, whoever they are, who are still off the reservation, the blanket Indians, with all the accoutrements of war dangling from their persons. [Laughter.] Perhaps the roll call will disclose who the three are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we would like to offer another amendment, namely, to concur in all the Senate amendments except that numbered 46, which is the amendment that takes the strip off Arizona and gives it to Utah, and the amendment numbered 31, page 53 of the bill as it came from the Senate, which is the amendment that gives in one place \$2,500,000 and in another place in the same section \$5,000,000 to the public-school fund of the proposed State. Now, I say if you would let your blanket Indians alone, if you had not put them down in writing, if you had not expressed this great distrust of them, if you had not bound them hand and foot, tongue and pen, the minority over here, plus thirty-three, or less than thirty-three, would adopt that amendment, and I say that you dare not trust the House of Representatives.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid in history you will go down with the name similar to that of an Indian chief who figured very largely some thirty years ago in the history of this country. They gave him the title of "Big Chief Afraid of his People." [Laughter.] I am afraid that the Speaker of this House will be known after a while as "Big Chief Afraid of his Majority." [Great laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate that the minority in this House can not control the action of the majority. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It is unfortunate always to be in the minority. It is sometimes unfortunate for the minority to so manipulate and manage the business as that the minority is growing "small by degrees and beautifully less" at every Congress. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I do not know anything about the question that seems to have af-



fects so forcibly the minds of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Republican side of this House held a caucus, or a conference, or whatever else you please to call it, and we did not invite the minority Members of the House to be present. We had not the slightest use for them. [Laughter on the Republican side.] There were differences of opinion on this side of the House. The public press says that thirty-three members of the conference voted against the proposition. That was two more than the gentleman from Mississippi was able to rally to his support not very long ago on a very momentous question, as he understood it [laughter on the Republican side], and whether the thirty-one were blanket Indians off from the reservation, or whether the majority of the minority were clothed in that useful garment I do not know. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I expect "the gentleman from Mississippi" was a blanket Indian himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. After a while the good Indians came off the reservation also, and organized in full force outside the reservation. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the blanket he wore on that occasion disclosed by an interior view the fallacy of his position. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] will permit an interruption, I will say that upon that occasion no writings were demanded upon this side. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, I know nothing about any writings. I have not seen any writing, and I do not know that there is any writing. The Republicans came together and presented a solid front in favor of what? In favor of trying to get some legislation introducing one or more new States, and I may say now, without divulging any state secrets, that the position of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], if carried into execution by the House, would absolutely defeat the introduction of any new State in this Congress. The bill passed by the Congress, and which we are now discussing, would not become a law in this Congress, and I think that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] knows that fact. So, now, what are we doing? Are we strangling anybody? Are there any to be whipped in? Why, Mr. Speaker, when the Members of the House of Representatives on the majority side get together and agree to something, does it follow that somebody has been whipped in? We differ in opinion. We discuss the subject, and we come to a conclusion. The majority governs on this side of the House, and finally and ultimately on both sides of the House. What use would it be to concur in the Senate amendments in part and send the bill back to the Senate nonconcurring in as to the main features of the bill? Everybody understands at least, and the gentleman draws from public report and public rumor his information, which he calls facts, that the Senate will not pass a bill giving statehood to New Mexico and to Arizona.

That the Senate may agree to a bill, the House bill, we hope; that it may agree to a part of the House bill, leaving out New Mexico and Arizona, is possible; but the whole question is now, and by this process, remitted to a conference committee, and when that conference committee comes into the House with its report, the minority side of this House will have a very easy job to get its views into the RECORD. I do not suppose that the facts at that time will be the same as they are now. I do not believe that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] himself will vote upon a conference report that brings a final settlement against the amendments that he is now proposing to ratify, nor do I believe that he will vote against the amendments that he is now proposing to negative. So the whole matter will be open, and nobody has been lashed that I know anything about. I respectfully urge the minority side of this House to let the machine of legislation go forward. The plan that they propose would be the inevitable defeat of this entire bill. Everybody understands that. Suppose, now, that there are men on this side of the House just as energetically opposed to the bill in its present form as there are on that side in favor of the bill in its present form. Suppose the bill was brought in here now with a report from the committee. It goes to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and one or two industrious Members can easily defeat the bill by the ordinary and well-regulated practices of parliamentary procedure. So if anything is to be done, we have taken the proper step to do it. We are trying to get a conference between the two Houses, an exchange of views and an ultimate submission to both Houses, each House by itself the views of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for a vote on this question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 161, nays 127, answered "present" 7, not voting 89, as follows:

## YEAS—161.

Adams, Wis.	Draper	Kinkaid	Powers, Mass.
Alexander	Dresser	Knapp	Reeder
Allen	Driscoll	Knopf	Roberts
Ames	Dunwell	Knowland	Rodenberg
Babcock	Esch	Kyle	Scott
Bartholdt	Foss	Lacey	Shiras
Bates	Foster, Vt.	Lafean	Slemp
Beidler	French	Landis, Frederick	Smith, Iowa
Birdsall	Fuller	Lawrence	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bishop	Gaines, W. Va.	Lilley	Smith, N. Y.
Routell	Gardner, Mass.	Littauer	Smith, Pa.
Bowersock	Gibson	Littlefield	Snapp
Bradley	Gillet, N. Y.	Loud	Southard
Brandeggee	Gillett, Cal.	Loudenslager	Southwick
Brooks	Gillett, Mass.	Lovering	Spalding
Brown, Pa.	Goebel	McCarthy	Stafford
Brown, Wis.	Graff	McCleary, Minn.	Steenerson
Brownlow	Greene	McCreary, Pa.	Stevens, Minn.
Burke	Grosvenor	McMorran	Sulloway
Burkett	Hamilton	Mahon	Tawney
Burleigh	Haskins	Mann	Thomas, Iowa
Burton	Haugen	Marshall	Tirrell
Butler, Pa.	Hedge	Martin	Townsend
Calderhead	Hemenway	Miller	Van Voorhis
Campbell	Henry, Conn.	Minor	Voilestead
Capron	Hepburn	Mondell	Vreeland
Castor	Hildebrandt	Morgan	Wachter
Conner	Hill, Conn.	Morrell	Wadsworth
Cooper, Pa.	Hinshaw	Mudd	Wanger
Cromer	Hitt	Murdock	Warner
Crumpacker	Hogg	Needham	Warnock
Currier	Holliday	Nevin	Watson
Curtis	Howell, N. J.	Norris	Webber
Dalzell	Howell, Utah	Otjen	Weems
Daniels	Huff	Overstreet	Wiley, N. J.
Darragh	Hughes, W. Va.	Parker	Wilson, Ill.
Davis, Minn.	Hull	Patterson, Pa.	Wood
Dayton	Humphrey, Wash.	Payne	Young
Dixon	Jenkins	Perkins	
Douglas	Jones, Wash.	Porter	
Dovener	Ketcham	Powers, Me.	

## NAYS—127.

Adamson	Garber	Livernash	Ryan
Aiken	Gillespie	Livingston	Scudder
Baker	Goldfogle	Lloyd	Shackelford
Bankhead	Granger	McLachlan	Sheppard
Barlett	Gregg	McLain	Sherley
Bassett	Griggs	McNary	Sims
Beall, Tex.	Gudger	Macon	Slayden
Beil, Cal.	Hamlin	Maddox	Small
Benton	Harrison	Maynard	Smith, Tex.
Bowers	Hay	Meyer, La.	Snook
Bowie	Heflin	Miers, Ind.	Southall
Brantley	Henry, Tex.	Moon, Tenn.	Sparkman
Brenzeale	Hopkins	Padgett	Splight
Brundidge	Houston	Page	Stanley
Burgess	Howard	Patterson, N. C.	Stephens, Tex.
Burleson	Hughes, N. J.	Pierce	Sulzer
Burnett	Humphreys, Miss.	Pinckney	Tate
Byrd	Hunt	Pou	Thayer
Caldwell	James	Pujo	Thomas, N. C.
Cassingham	Jones, Va.	Rainey	Trimble
Clayton	Kitchin, Claude	Randall, Tex.	Underwood
Cochran, Mo.	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Reid	Vandiver
Cowherd	Kluttz	Rhea	Van Duzer
Croft	Lamar, Fla.	Richardson, Ala.	Wade
Davey, La.	Lamar, Mo.	Rider	Wallace
Davis, Fla.	Lamb	Rixey	Webb
Denny	Legare	Robb	Wiley, Ala.
Dickerman	Lester	Robertson, La.	Williams, Ill.
Field	Lever	Robinson, Ark.	Williams, Miss.
Finley	Lewis	Robinson, Ind.	Wynn
Fitzgerald	Lind	Rucker	Zenor
Flood	Little	Russell	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Bonyng	Prince	Sullivan, Mass.	Woodyard
Brick	Shull	Taylor	

## NOT VOTING—89.

Acheson	Dougherty	Hunter	Ransdell, La.
Adams, Pa.	Dwight	Jackson, Md.	Richardson, Tenn.
Badger	Emerich	Jackson, Ohio	Ruppert
Bede	Evans	Johnson	Scarborough
Benny	Fitzpatrick	Kehee	Sherman
Bingham	Flack	Kelher	Shober
Broussard	Fordney	Kennedy	Sibley
Buckman	Foster, Ill.	Kline	Smith, Ill.
Butler, Mo.	Fowler	Landis, Chas. B.	Smith, Ky.
Cassell	Gaines, Tenn.	Lindsay	Smith, Samuel W.
Clark	Gardner, Mich.	Longworth	Sperry
Cockran, N. Y.	Gardner, N. J.	Lorimer	Sterling
Connell	Garner	Lucking	Sullivan, N. Y.
Cooper, Tex.	Gilbert	McAndrews	Swanson
Cooper, Wis.	Glass	McCall	Talbot
Cousins	Gooch	McDermott	Thomas, Ohio
Crowley	Goulden	Marsh	Weisse
Cushman	Griffith	Moon, Pa.	Williamson
Davidson	Hardwick	Olmsted	Wilson, N. Y.
De Armond	Hearst	Otis	Wright
Deemer	Hermann	Palmer	
Dinsmore	Hill, Miss.	Patterson, Tenn.	
	Hitchcock	Pearre	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:  
For this vote:

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania with Mr. SHOBER.  
Mr. BEDE with Mr. COOPER of Texas.  
Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. DINSMORE.  
Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey with Mr. BADGER.  
Mr. HUNTER with Mr. DOUGHERTY.  
Mr. KENNEDY with Mr. JOHNSON.  
Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts.  
Mr. OTIS with Mr. TALBOTT.  
Mr. PRINCE with Mr. GRIFFITH.  
Mr. SIBLEY with Mr. KLINE.  
Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. LUCKING.

For the balance of the day:

Mr. JACKSON of Maryland with Mr. LINDSAY.  
Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. DE ARMOND.  
Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. McDERMOTT.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. POWERS of Maine, and Mr. MOON of Tennessee.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6015. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ritchie;

S. 6804. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Leefe;

S. 6492. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Howe;

S. 3406. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda D. Penick;

S. 7148. An act to grant certain lands to the State of Ohio;

S. 7173. An act to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island;

S. 7103. An act confirming the title of the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company to certain lands in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; and

Senate concurrent resolution 101.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Committee on Printing of the Senate, with two Members of the present House of Representatives who are reelected to the next Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or any subcommittee of said special joint committee, are hereby authorized to examine into the numbers printed of the various documents, reports, bills, and other papers published by order of Congress, or of either House thereof, and of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if, in their judgment, the conditions as they find them warrant remedial legislation to report a bill at the next session of Congress making such reductions in the numbers and cost of printing and such changes and reduction in the distribution of said publications as they may deem expedient, with a report giving their reasons therefor; and that the said committee is also authorized to investigate the printing and binding for the Executive Departments executed at the Government Printing Office and at the branch printing offices and binderies in the various Departments, and if, in their judgment, the conditions as they find them warrant remedial legislation, to report a bill at the next session of Congress, making such reductions in expenses and imposing such checks as they may deem expedient, with a report giving their reasons therefor; and said committee is further authorized to make any other investigation calculated, in their opinion, to reduce the cost of the public printing, and report the result thereof; and in making the inquiries required by this resolution said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer to report its hearings, to call on the heads of Executive Departments and the Public Printer for such information in regard to the preceding matters as they may desire, to do whatever is necessary for a thorough investigation of the subject, and to sit during the recess of Congress. Any subcommittee may exercise the powers hereby granted to said committee, and the expenses of said investigation shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers duly approved by the chairman of the Committee on Printing and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.*

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 17331. An act relating to a dam across Rainy River.

GEORGE H. BRUSSTAR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 17117, an act granting an increase of pension to George H. Brusstar, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire moves that the House do nonconcur in the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. FULLER, and Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

NATHAN C. D. BOND.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 16629, an act granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. D. Bond, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire moves that the House do concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

LAURA P. SWENTZEL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 14575) granting an increase of pension to Laura P. Swentzel, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ABEL GROVENOR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 17411) granting an increase of pension to Abel Grovenor, with Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES SHAW.

The SPEAKER also laid before House the bill (H. R. 16859) granting an increase of pension to James Shaw, with Senate amendment.

The amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

OLIVER H. MARTIN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 15489) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Martin, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

MICHAEL KEATING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 16389) granting an increase of pension to Michael Keating, with Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 18467, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion of Mr. Foss was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. DALZELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 18467, the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after the word "dollars," on page 29, line 16:

"Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated for dredging, improving, and building retaining walls in and about the reserve basin shall be expended until there has been prepared ready for submission to Congress at its next session an estimate of the completed cost of such reserve basin."

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, before that amendment is voted upon I think it is well for the committee to understand what the purpose of it is. My colleague [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER] has the figures, and I have been looking for him. He was here a few moments ago.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this paragraph be passed over temporarily.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Will it be proper to ask that this paragraph be passed at this time, to be taken up later, when my colleague [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER] returns to the Chamber?



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asks unanimous consent to pass over for the present, without prejudice, the pending paragraph. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Norfolk, Va.: Piers and slips, to continue, \$50,000; dredging, to continue, \$5,000; electric plant, extensions, \$20,000; paving and grading, additional, \$7,500; railroad rolling stock, additional, \$3,000; fire-protection system, extensions, \$5,000; heating system, extensions, \$3,000; locomotive, \$6,000; underground conduit system, \$10,000; improvement to 100-ton shears, \$15,000; telephone system, extension, \$2,000; sewers, extensions, \$3,000; wharf extension at St. Helena, \$8,500; roads at St. Helena, \$4,000; storehouse and issuing room for clothing at St. Helena, \$3,500; house for contagious diseases, \$2,500; in all, navy-yard, Norfolk, Va., \$148,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order against the language on page 31, line 3, as follows:

House for contagious diseases, \$2,500.

Mr. FOSS. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] offered an amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to reserve a point of order against the provision in the paragraph to which I have referred.

Mr. FOSS. What is the provision?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It relates to a house for contagious diseases.

Mr. FOSS. Under what paragraph?

Mr. FITZGERALD. On page 31, line 3.

Mr. FOSS. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] make the point of order or reserve the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve it. I will state why, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] desires. This is a provision for a contagious-disease house at a navy-yard. Now, if it had been provided for at a naval hospital, I could see the propriety of it; but to have a contagious-disease house at a navy-yard hardly seems proper.

Mr. FOSS. I do not understand the gentleman. There is so much noise around here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I said that this provides for a contagious-disease house at a navy-yard. Now, if this provision were included under an item where there is a naval hospital, I could see the propriety of it.

Mr. FOSS. There is a naval hospital at Norfolk, Va.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it not provided for specifically at some place else in the bill?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; that is provided for under the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why should not this item be included there?

Mr. FOSS. It should properly go in under that, only that the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery desires that Yards and Docks should build it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This would not be the beginning of a naval barracks there, would it?

Mr. FOSS. No. That is one of the large hospitals we have in the Navy, and it is very desirable there should be some small establishment for contagious diseases. As the gentleman sees, it only amounts to \$2,500. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY] is more familiar with it than I am.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My opposition is not so much to the building as to the bureau under which it appears.

Mr. FOSS. Well, the Bureau of Yards and Docks could better build it, perhaps, than the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

Mr. RIXEY. If the chairman of the committee will permit me, I will state that I understand this contagious-disease house will not be put in the navy-yard, but upon an island, which is separated from the navy-yard by what is called St. Juliens Creek. That is the proper place for it. There can be no question about that. The only question is whether it ought to be built by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery or the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LOUDENSLAGER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 18329. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, Key West, Fla.: Fire-protection system, extension,

\$3,000; pumping plant for fresh water, \$5,000; dredging and filling in, \$15,000; water system, \$6,000; in all, navy-yard, Key West, Fla., \$29,000.

Mr. SNOOK. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I had some time reserved under general debate, and I will ask unanimous consent to proceed for ten minutes.

Mr. DAYTON. A point of order. I can not hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. SNOOK. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSS. Upon the naval bill?

Mr. SNOOK. Upon the naval bill; that is what I wish to talk about.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SNOOK. Mr. Chairman, the newspapers of the country have been engaged in a controversy which has reached this House, as to what was the cause of the defeat of our party in the last national election.

Some have said it was due to the personal popularity of the President; some, to the prosperity which the country has enjoyed, while some have hinted that it was due to the fact that we have not done our best to carry out the pledges we have made to the people.

To all those who are inclined to carry on such a fruitless discussion I would recommend the advice contained in an editorial published in the Florida Times-Union soon after the election, in which the editor admonishes the party in the words of the poet:

Let be! Let be!  
Who can undo what time hath done,  
Beckon lost music from the broken lute,  
Or dig the sunken sunset from the sea?

When I come to consider the vast sum carried by this appropriation for the maintenance of the Navy in a time of profound peace, I am inclined to believe that there may be something in the doctrine that we have not done all that we could as a party to carry out the pledges that we made the people. And I want to ask this side of the House if it may not be worth while to at least attempt to show that we still believe in the pledge we made when we said in our national platform that "a nation's influence should be extended, not by force or violence, but through the persuasive power of a high and honorable example?"

This bill carries more than a hundred million dollars. The war spirit seems to so thoroughly dominate Congress that no matter how profound the peace, how little the prospect of war, each year sees an increase of this appropriation, until, as was shown last year by my colleague, it has increased from \$13,907,000 in 1886 to \$100,070,000 in 1905.

I do not want it to be understood that I am a crank on the subject of war, that I believe in the doctrine of nonresistance.

I certainly favor all reasonable appropriations for the Army and Navy. But I wish to add my protest, feeble and fruitless though it may be, to that of my colleagues [Mr. BURTON and Mr. DE ARMOND], so forcibly expressed in the last session of this Congress, against this radical departure from the principles upon which this Government was founded and under which it has been so successfully administered for more than a century. I do protest against such enormous expenditures of the public money in order that we may boast that we have the largest navy in the world.

I do not believe it is worth while for us to enter into a vain rivalry with the nations of the Old World as to who can maintain the largest navy. I appeal to the House, if we lay aside the incentive that comes from a pure spirit of boastfulness, for a justification of this course of legislation.

If we are to adhere to the doctrine of Jefferson, of friendship for all and entangling alliances with none, is there the remotest possibility that such a large Navy will ever be necessary for national defense? On the other hand, does not this course rather say to the nations of the Old World that from now on we intend to take a hand in their disputes? More than once since I have been a Member of this House have I seen the chairman of the Naval Committee try to cut off an appropriation for one of the numerous navy-yards of the country.

In all such attempts, although he has shown us that he felt sure he was right, he has met with humiliation and defeat. Does not the present programme invite every port in the country to start a clamor for the establishment of a navy-yard?

And all those already established to raise a cry for increased and unwarranted appropriations? Although this bill carries for the maintenance and increase of yards and docks over three and a half millions, and although over one hundred millions have been invested in those yards, yet, in the opinion of a majority of the committee, they are entirely useless for the purpose of the construction of new ships in competition with private yards.

How can such a course be reconciled with a wise, economic, and business-like administration of public affairs? The table which is attached to the report on this bill shows that we now have for the use of the Navy under course of construction thirty-one vessels, with a tonnage of 327,170 tons—more than any other nation in the world, save Great Britain, which has under course of construction 330,235 tons.

We are building nearly twice as much as France, three times as much as Russia or Austria, two and one-half times as much as Germany, and nine times as much as Japan, about whose naval prowess we hear so much. There may be many reasons why the European nations should maintain a large navy that do not apply to us. They have grown up by the exercise of the art of war. They have many entangling alliances, many bitter hatreds and jealousies that have been fostered by hundreds of years of warfare. None of these reasons apply to us with our freedom from alliances and our wonderful natural resources. Our surroundings, the teachings of the fathers, our institutions, the patriotism of our citizens, demand only such a navy and army as speak for defense and do not endanger the peace of the world.

I have no patience with that class of thinkers who claim that a large army and navy make for peace. If so, the teachings of a hundred years have been in vain. This theory, carried to its logical conclusion, would say that all the laws for the protection of society making it a crime to carry concealed weapons have been a mistake, and would turn society into a walking arsenal.

If this is so, we should burn our histories and write new ones for the purpose of teaching the coming generation this new and strange doctrine. I am surprised how such a doctrine can find so many followers, and can explain it only on the theory of the philosopher who said:

It is amazing how implicitly a fallacy skillfully clothed in words is accepted by even well-informed persons; how tenaciously they cling to it.

Another reason why this appropriation should not be so large at this time is that the revenues will not be large enough for the coming year to meet the expenses of administering the Government. As the different appropriation bills have been brought before Congress at this session the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] has closely questioned the Member in charge, and he has finally shown that there is likely to be a deficit in the public revenues for the coming year of nearly \$20,000,000. And I now warn the gentleman when these bills come back from the Senate the amendments added by that body are likely to make this deficit much larger than he expects; and though the President approves of the present naval policy, it must also be remembered that he said in his annual message to Congress—

#### CAUTION AGAINST EXTRAVAGANCE.

Battle ships and forts, public buildings, and improved waterways are investments which should be made when we have the money; but abundant revenues and a large surplus always invite extravagance, and constant care should be taken to guard against unnecessary increase of the ordinary expenses of government. The cost of doing Government business should be regulated with the same rigid scrutiny as the cost of doing a private business.

To show the unprecedented growth of appropriations I submit the following table, prepared by the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] and published in his speech of February 14, 1905:

Table of expenditures, from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Year.	War.	Navy.	Indians.	Pensions.	Miscellaneous.
1890..	\$44,582,838.08	\$22,006,206.24	\$6,708,046.67	\$106,936,855.07	\$81,403,256.49
1891..	48,720,065.01	26,113,896.46	8,527,469.01	124,415,951.40	110,048,167.49
1892..	46,895,456.30	29,174,138.98	11,150,577.67	134,583,052.79	99,841,988.61
1893..	49,641,773.47	30,136,084.43	13,945,347.27	159,357,557.87	103,732,799.27
1894..	54,567,929.85	31,701,293.79	10,293,481.52	141,177,284.96	101,943,884.07
1895..	51,804,759.13	28,797,795.73	9,939,754.21	141,395,228.87	93,279,730.14
1896..	50,830,920.89	27,147,732.38	12,165,528.23	139,434,000.98	87,216,234.62
1897..	48,950,267.89	34,561,546.29	13,016,802.46	141,053,164.63	90,401,267.82
1898..	91,992,000.29	58,823,984.80	10,994,667.70	147,452,368.61	96,520,505.17
1899..	229,841,254.47	63,942,104.25	12,805,711.14	139,394,929.07	119,191,255.90
1900..	134,774,767.78	55,953,077.72	10,175,106.76	140,877,316.02	105,773,190.16
1901..	144,615,697.30	60,506,978.47	10,896,073.35	139,323,621.99	122,282,003.10
1902..	112,272,216.08	67,803,128.24	10,049,584.86	138,488,559.73	113,469,323.91
1903..	118,619,520.15	82,618,084.18	12,935,168.08	138,425,646.07	124,944,289.74
1904..	115,035,410.58	102,966,101.55	10,438,350.09	142,559,266.36	186,766,702.92

#### Actual expenditures.

War, 1898 to 1905, inclusive....	\$1,024,221,167.43	
War, 1890 to 1897, inclusive....	395,994,010.68	
Increase .....		\$628,227,157.75
Navy, 1898 to 1905, inclusive....	\$590,108,549.21	
Navy, 1890 to 1897, inclusive....	229,638,694.30	
Increase .....		360,469,844.91
Total increase .....		988,697,001.66

In this connection he said:

In making the above computation I have added in each instance the appropriations for the Army and Navy for 1905, as it is obvious that the expenditures for that year can not now be obtained, and I wished an equal period of eight years to compare with the previous computation.

This analysis shows that the total expenditures for the War and Navy—and that includes fortifications, because they are under the expenditures for the War Department—the total excess for 1898 to 1905 for these two great branches as against excessive appropriations of \$1,151,844,477, over the preceding eight years are \$988,697,001. That is the actual expenditure during that period. The increases in the War Department were \$395,994,010; in the Navy Department, \$229,638,694.

And in comparing the appropriations for the Army and Navy with those for other purposes he sums the matter up by saying:

Now, then, what is the increase in the army and navy appropriation during this period of time? Three hundred and forty-one per cent as compared with 22 per cent. In other words, the increase for Army and Navy and fortifications during the last eight years as compared with the preceding eight years is fifteen times the normal increase in the ordinary expenses of the Government of the United States.

I appeal to the House if these figures and statements do not show that we are pursuing a most dangerous policy. A reasonable curtailment of the appropriations for the Army and Navy would not only help to wipe out the deficit in the revenues; but would furnish money to carry out other much-needed legislation.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] showed the House that there are many public buildings that are entirely inadequate for the public needs. Their extension and improvement can not be thought of while so much money goes to the Army and Navy. The survivors of the civil war have been asking Congress for years for a service pension. They ask for a measure that will recognize the service they rendered the country. Their demand is just, and I believe should have been granted years ago. There are a number of such bills now pending before the committee of which I have the honor to be a member.

Some of us have favored reporting one of these bills for passage, but we are always met with the cry of insufficient revenues. I for one believe it would be good policy to take enough from the appropriations for the Army and Navy to provide a service pension for the surviving soldiers of the civil war.

Mr. Chairman, we cry "Peace!" "Peace!" but year after year these appropriations continue to increase.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] in most eloquent and fervid language sings of the glories of international arbitration. All this does not seem to reach the present Administration or touch the heart of the majority of the Committee on Naval Affairs. How well Tennyson's Song of the Brook, with slight changes, would tell the story of the remarkable growth of these appropriations.

I chatter, chatter, as I flow  
To join the brimming river,  
For peace may come and peace may go,  
But I grow on forever.

[Applause.]

In conclusion, I would say let us have an army and navy commensurate in size with the greatness of our country; one that will maintain our just rights at any cost. But in providing that army and navy let us put our main dependence in that love of country and patriotism that comes from free institutions and is enkindled in the heart by the exercise of civil and religious liberty, that which has proved a tower of strength to us in every time of trouble. Let us scorn to puff ourselves up and take delight in vain boasting. Let us cry down everything in our national life that looks toward unjust aggression or endangers the peace of the world.

In short, let us hold to the beneficent teachings of a hundred years and turn our attention to promoting the peace, happiness, comfort, and welfare of our citizens. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Mare Island, California: Railroad system, extension, \$5,000; electric-plant system, extension, \$5,000; improvement of channel in Mare Island Strait, to continue, \$100,000; sewer system, extensions, \$3,000; telephone system, extensions, \$1,000; paving and grading, to continue, \$10,000; heating system, extension, \$5,000; addition to fire-engine house, building 99, \$4,000; two floats, \$4,000; improvements to building 77, \$1,500; improvements to building 71, \$500; moving and improving washhouse, \$4,200; completion of torpedo-boat wharf, \$3,000; shed for condemned provisions, \$1,000; recreation building and equipment, \$3,000; in all, navy-yard, Mare Island, \$150,200.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed without prejudice. There is a paragraph on page 68 against which a point of order will be made. If that point of order is sustained it will be absolutely necessary to amend this paragraph. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the paragraph just read be passed for the present without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Puget Sound, Washington: Sewer system, extensions, \$5,000; to continue grading, \$20,000; fire-protection system, extensions, \$10,000; electric-light plant, extensions, \$10,000; telephone system, extensions, \$1,500; railroad and equipment, extensions, \$5,000; boat shop for construction and repair, to equip and complete, \$25,000; water system, extensions, \$3,000; heating system, extensions, \$5,000; locomotive and crane track about dry dock, to continue, \$30,000; dredging, to continue, \$10,000; quay wall, extension, \$25,000; roads and walks, extensions, \$5,000; joiner shop, for construction and repair, to complete, \$5,000; machinery for yards and docks, \$2,000; piers, additional, \$50,000; in all, navy-yard, Puget Sound, Washington, \$213,500.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if any estimate was sent in to the committee with reference to the building of a new dry dock at this yard?

Mr. FOSS. In reply to the gentleman, I will state that I have the original estimates that were sent by the Department, and it does not appear that there was a new dry dock asked for this year.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understood that to be the fact, but I wanted to be sure about it.

I want to call the attention of the committee to the situation with reference to this yard and with reference to the docking of vessels on the Pacific coast.

The Puget Sound Navy-Yard is the only navy-yard on the Pacific coast that can be reached by a battle ship. I know that the members of the committee are very friendly to this yard, and I feel that they have done all that they felt they could possibly do toward the development of the yard this year. Admiral Endicott, on page 221 of the hearings, with reference to this yard, in answer to the question as to certain items, whether or not they could be left over, said this:

I should say that as Puget Sound is almost our only reliance on the Pacific coast we ought to be a little liberal with that yard.

Then in the hearings the question came up as to whether any battle ships had been taken care of at this point. I find that one of the members of the committee (Mr. VREELAND) made this statement:

You have not had any battle ships there, have you?

In other words, it seems that some members of the committee had an idea that no battle ships had ever been taken to the Puget Sound Navy-Yard. The admiral replied:

I think there have been. I speak of battle ships because they are one of the largest vessels. The large cruisers can not come up to Mare Island Navy-Yard because of the low water there, and must go to Puget Sound also.

Every battle ship that has been docked on the Pacific coast has been at the Puget Sound Navy-Yard, and among the vessels that have been docked there have been the *Oregon*, the *Wisconsin*, and the *Iowa*, battle ships, and the *Brooklyn* and the *New York*, large cruisers, drawing almost as much water as the battle ships.

The dry dock at Puget Sound is of wood, and yet its record in efficiency, I think, will compare favorably with, if not surpass, that of any other dry dock in the United States.

We are in this situation: A wooden dry dock can not last forever. This dock has been tested thoroughly by the largest vessels in the Navy. The *Iowa* has been there and docked several times, and the *Oregon* has been docked there several times. The time is coming in the near future when repairs will have to be made at this dry dock. We have only one dry dock on the Pacific coast, and that is at Puget Sound, where battle ships can be docked. That dry dock is apt to become unavailable at almost any time, and whenever that time comes then there is no place on the Pacific coast where one of these large battle ships or war vessels can be docked.

It seems to me that it would be wisdom on the part of this Government to begin at once the construction of another dry dock at Puget Sound Navy-Yard, because it will take some time to construct it. The dock there now is bound to get out of repair, and then the question will confront this Government, Where can we send the ships to have them repaired if anything should happen to it? They could not come in there, and they would have to go to Esquimalt, in British territory, or some other foreign point. If in framing this bill we have an idea that we are likely to get into trouble with a foreign country, it seems to me that we ought to have proper docking facilities on the Pacific coast rather than to be looking after battle ships. It seems to me that it would be the height of wisdom, if we must have retrenchment anywhere, to take some of the money that it is proposed to use in building battle ships for the construction of a dry dock, which, in my judgment, will be imperatively needed on the Pacific coast in the near future. On the Pacific Ocean will be the war operations if any ever come. We ought to be in such a

situation that if it does come, if our vessels are disabled, we can take them somewhere in our own country for repairs.

Now, I say nothing about the station at Mare Island, but at Puget Sound we have a navy-yard where the largest battle ships can enter, and they can come to the wharves by their own steam in all kinds of weather and on any kind of a tide, and it is so situated and located that we ought to have there another dry dock, and we ought to commence it, in my judgment, just as soon as possible. What are battle ships worth if there is no place where they can be docked or repaired? Better have none if we can not keep them in condition.

I realize that on this bill we can not start the initiation of that dry dock. I believe the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee would be disposed to do it if they could. I simply call attention of the House to this situation because it is a matter that must be pressed and taken up in the near future. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 21, page 32, the words "piers, additional, \$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 21, page 32, strike out the words "piers, additional, \$50,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it was stated at the outset in the consideration of this bill that the Committee on Naval Affairs had not authorized any new improvements in the different navy-yards of the country. That was one of the reasons given for the refusal to consider at all an amendment to improve the water front at the navy-yard in New York. It seems from the hearings before the committee that in addition to this \$50,000 which is appropriated for the purpose of completing piers, there is also contained in the paragraph a provision appropriating \$25,000 for the extension of quay walls, which will serve to some extent the same purpose. I do not suppose in the present temper of the committee this amendment will prevail, but I wish to make this statement so as to emphasize the fact, that it was not quite accurate for the chairman of the committee to say at the outset that no new improvements had been authorized in this bill for the different yards of the country. This is a new one.

Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. The gentleman from New York will note that the word "additional" appears after the word "piers," which indicates that it is the carrying out of a plan already entered upon.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That does not appear from the hearings, if the gentleman will pardon me. There are some piers there now. This is to provide additional piers. There is no plan or project that provides for any stipulated number of piers in addition to those now in existence. I do not say that these additional piers are not necessary for the proper equipment of the yard; but I do say that if the committee is to carry out the plan announced, that prevailed in the framing of this bill, the item should go out, as it is a new improvement.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make reply, and yet I think the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] ought not to go on record entirely unchallenged. The piers at this navy-yard are not new work. This is simply for an extension of those that have already been built. They were commenced in the years gone by, and this extension is necessary to meet the increasing demands upon the yard. The statement made by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], was simply used in the general sense of starting a new project, starting a new yard or a new building in a new yard. These piers have been started and have not been completed. The piers in themselves are a continuing work, at least in a sense, and this is simply an addition to those already placed there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to call the attention of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] to the statement of Admiral Endicott before this committee. The chairman of the committee read:

Piers, additional, \$50,000.

Admiral ENDICOTT. I think they are needed. We need some landing slips there.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. On the same plan we follow in regard to these other items, should not they be cut?

Admiral ENDICOTT. It will take \$50,000 to complete one pier.

Now, there is nothing in the hearings which indicate or which show that any piers have ever been authorized for this yard. There are piers there now, and this is an additional pier. It is a new authorization. It is a new work under the statement of the chairman of the committee, and if the committee is to be sustained this new work should not be authorized. It is not an extension of existing piers.



Mr. BASSETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word upon the general subject of the neglect of the New York Navy-Yard. An inspection of the appropriations to the various navy-yards along the Atlantic coast shows that the New York Navy-Yard has suffered the deepest cut of any from the Department estimates, although it is the largest and most important yard in the country. Nearly all the economizing is aimed at this navy-yard and very little or none at all at the others. The New York Navy-Yard is situated where in time of war it is the natural base for the protection of the large Atlantic coast cities. It stands where ships in service could be repaired most handily in time of war. They can enter and depart through the Sound or through the Narrows. The State of New York is now about to spend the sum of \$100,000,000 for the enlargement and improvement of the Erie Canal between New York City and Buffalo.

Through this canal and the Oswego Canal many of the smaller naval boats can in an emergency be taken to the Great Lakes. It does not matter so much where battle ships are built, but the right location for repairs in time of war is of the utmost importance. There is no navy-yard so located for usefulness as this New York Navy-Yard, and yet there has been a plain and unmistakable tendency during late years to cut down the estimates of the Department in building it up and in equipping it with modern appliances and to prefer other yards to this. That tendency is especially noticeable in the bill before the House this year from the Naval Committee. I wish in this connection to protest against the lack of representation from the people of that great port upon the committees having to do with harbors and the Navy. I am about to leave the House of Representatives, not returning, and I can speak perhaps with somewhat more plainness than would be expected of one who was to come again. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is neither right nor just to that city and the great interests that it represents that in the Appropriation Committee, the Naval Committee, and the River and Harbor Committee, the three great committees of this House which control the comparative attention or neglect that is meted out to the ports of the country, Greater New York has no representation whatever. I say this word in earnestness, as I say it plainly. Local issues and local methods that individuals can not control tend to cause frequent changes in the membership from New York City in this House. Lack of time, service, or some influence not favorable to the port of New York seems to cause this nonrepresentation. But, Mr. Chairman, each one of us from New York City represents more than 200,000 people. Those people deserve just as much attention as any 200,000 people in any other part of the country, and I enter this plea now for consideration in the future, and in the hope that representation from New York City, regardless of party, will be given on one or more of these three committees, not alone to influence fair consideration, but to inform the committees regarding the needs of the port.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word on the New York Navy-Yard. The New York Navy-Yard is one of the oldest navy-yards which we have in this country, and so far as recognition is concerned, it has received more recognition, I think, than all the other yards put together almost since the foundation of the Government. Simply because this year we do not appropriate money for the New York yard is not because we are slighting the yard in any way. It is because the yard does not need it. It is an old yard and it is a well-equipped yard. It is a yard up to date, whereas some of the other yards we are appropriating money for are comparatively new yards, and, therefore, they need new equipment; but the gentleman ought not to complain if he has read the history of previous navy appropriation bills for the last twenty-five, thirty, forty, and even fifty years, as to the recognition which always the New York yard has had. So far as the new proposition is concerned, that the gentleman introduced as an amendment here to the naval bill yesterday, that is a proposition which includes a good many things.

It includes cutting off the cob dock; it includes opening up the Whitney basin to the main channel of the stream, and a whole lot of new piers, and one thing and another, involving an expenditure of a million and a half dollars, and the committee did not think it was wise at this time to go into that expenditure even if in their judgment they should determine that it was a good thing for the navy-yard. Now, Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for a moment? I represent one of the districts surrounding that navy-yard.

Mr. FOSS. Ask for unanimous consent to print in the Record.

Mr. BAKER. Oh, no; I do not want to get in the Record.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can have a vote on this.

Mr. BAKER. Yield me just five minutes.

Mr. FOSS. Oh, well.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I can not allow the remarks of my good friend, my colleague from New York [Mr. BASSETT], to go without some comment from me. I represent on this floor a part of the city of Brooklyn, which, in conjunction with that my friend from the seventh district [Mr. FITZGERALD] represents, constitutes the navy-yard territory. I suppose as large a proportion of the employees of that navy-yard live in my district as live in the district of my friend [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Now, Mr. Chairman, I deny that the people of Brooklyn are interested, as a people, in large appropriations for that navy-yard. I repudiate that proposition. The people of Brooklyn may very properly desire protection from outside attack, but the question of whether these ships are built in Brooklyn or whether they are built in San Francisco or whether they are built in any other part of the country is of no moment to the people of my city. Those people who believe that war is a danger, that there is a possibility of war, those people very properly feel they should be protected. I sympathize with those people, ridiculous as I think this talk of war is, but the question of where these ships are going to be built has nothing to do with the protection that these ships shall accord to Brooklyn or any part of the country. The ships that are built in the Brooklyn Navy-Yard will just as likely protect the people of San Francisco or New Orleans as those of New York, and I deny emphatically the proposition that the people of my city are interested as a whole in any particular navy-yard. Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, there are some interested there, the people who are working in the navy-yard. They may desire large appropriations. They live in Brooklyn and they want to continue that kind of employment, but those are not all the people of Brooklyn; they constitute a very small proportion of the whole people. Quite a large proportion of them, no doubt, live in my district, and those few hundreds will say, "BAKER is not protecting our interests" when he raises his voice upon this floor against this enormous, wasteful, criminal, expenditure, but I do not come upon this floor to represent a few hundred men who work in that navy-yard. I come here to represent, as best I can, the sentiments of 200,000 people who live in my district.

No man because he has a personal interest in the maintenance of a navy-yard can influence me to vote one penny in favor of this wasteful expenditure, but I deny most emphatically the proposition that the people as a whole desire or are interested in any particular navy-yard or the establishment or equipment of any particular navy-yard, whether it is in their city or not. Mr. Chairman, just one word more. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes.

Mr. BAKER. I desire to say just one word against the whole policy which is embodied in this bill. Of course the chairman of the committee may feel I am hardly treating him fairly in discussing this matter, but I can not refrain from availing myself of this opportunity to call the attention of the House to some of the terrible things which come out of this war spirit. I have here another cable dispatch which appeared in the New York Times of December 18. And what does it say? Here is a great war going on between Russia and Japan, and we are told upon this floor, and the people of those two countries are told, that the great mass of the people are interested in this war. I do not believe that. On the contrary, the evidence, of which this cablegram is but an instance, shows apparently in an overwhelming manner that the great mass of the Russian people are not in favor of it; that they believe this war to be criminal, senseless, and needless; that they do not feel that a man because he lives in the islands of Japan is necessarily an inherent and hereditary enemy of their own country.

TERRIBLE SCENES IN POLAND—MEN ORDERED TO THE WAR KILL THEIR CHILDREN—WIVES COMMIT SUICIDE.

[Special cable to the New York Times.]

PARIS, December 17.

Great precautions continue to be taken in Poland to prevent the real situation provoked there by the Russo-Japanese war from becoming known to the outside world, and nothing has been made public through official channels, but according to trustworthy correspondence received here by prominent members of the Polish colony the situation is an awful one.

More than 40,000 reservists have just been mobilized and sent to the front in spite of their protests that Russia is not their fatherland and that they prefer to die in Poland, fighting for liberty and independence, to becoming food for Japanese cannon.

In some towns of Poland wives of reservists have thrown themselves in front of trains which were transporting their husbands to Russia and have been crushed to death.

In three provinces the people have been fired upon by Russian recruiting parties. At Goston, when orders were given to decimate the Polish reservists who refused to march, the Polish Colonel Dzwonkowski blew his own brains out in front of his men.

Contrary to the alleged orders of the Czar, fathers of families and widowers with families are taken without discrimination. One man, on receiving marching orders, hanged his three children and then gave himself up to the military authorities with the remark, "I had no one to whom to leave them."



Another man was sent for on the day of his wife's death. He thereupon killed both his children, a girl of 2 years and a new-born boy, with a hatchet and placed them in their mother's coffin.

In another case a man killed his wife, his children, and himself.

We are told that in some towns of Poland where the wives of reservists—the men who have been called out to go to Manchuria and fight Japan—have thrown themselves in front of the trains that were to transport their husbands to that war, and have been crushed to death. Think of that! Does that spirit, the spirit that says that war is wrong, and that the people of the Russias have no natural grievance against the people of Japan, get any expression through their Government? No.

But I want to ask this House if there is any expression given upon this floor to the hundreds of thousands and millions of people in this country who feel the same as those people do, that war is inherently wrong, that it is not unavoidable—and men will persist in saying upon this floor that it is unavoidable—and the way to avoid it is not to appropriate a hundred millions of dollars to expand your Navy, but rather the way to avoid it is to say to the other great nations of the world, "Come, join with us in an agreement whereby an immediate and large reduction can be made of the enormous armaments now in existence." Thus, Mr. Chairman, shall we obviate the possibility of such fearful scenes being hereafter enacted anywhere in the world as are pictured in this cablegram.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] has expired.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, can I have a minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] asks for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, by the permission of the chairman of the committee, I move that we return to the paragraph containing the provision for the League Island Navy-Yard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph relating to the League Island Navy-Yard. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for a reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "dollars," on page 29, line 16:

"Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated for dredging, improving, and building retaining walls in and about the reserve basin shall be expended until there has been prepared ready for submission to Congress at its next session an estimate of the completed cost of such reserve basin."

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to my colleague [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER], who has the figures showing how very necessary have been the appropriations for this yard in the last six years.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Chairman, I shall occupy the time of the House but for a few moments. I was surprised yesterday at the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who is generally well informed, in his making the statement that he did concerning this great naval station located on the Delaware River. It is true that this station has had quite a large sum of money appropriated for its betterments within the last few years, but it should also be taken into consideration that this is a new establishment. And the gentleman evidently had no knowledge at all of the subject upon which he spoke save of the figures which he read from the appropriations or from the testimony which was elicited before the committee, for he speaks of this improvement being made under the auspices of the Navy Department as inuring wholly to the improvement of the channel of the Delaware River, and if he had any knowledge of the location and of the fresh-water basin at League Island he would know that it is no part of the river Delaware. And none of the money that has been expended for the fresh-water basin has in any way improved the river Delaware. The motion that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] makes would, under natural conditions, be a very wise and proper one, if the money expended by the Government could not be utilized until the whole and completed project was brought forth; but the very natural conditions surrounding this place make it so that whatever it expends is useful.

Looking over the appropriations for the last ten years, I find that the completed naval station at New York, for dredging, docking, and improvements of that kind, has had \$928,000 expended upon it, and with very little increased facilities for

docking the vessels of this Government, while the League Island Navy-Yard, considered by every naval official, by the Department, and every Member of Congress who has given it consideration to be the ideal spot, has had but \$1,121,000 expended on that naval station, and in that this expenditure has given at least 10,000 feet of increased dockage on the reserve basin, besides three or four thousand feet on the river front.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the members of this committee should not support the motion of the gentleman from New York, because it is not a local question. It arises above and beyond that, and is a national question. The Department, the naval officers, and every committee of the Government that has visited it make the statement, unqualifiedly, that this is the best reserve station in the United States. Let us, therefore, rise above locality, and vote that this appropriation shall stay in the bill without any limitation.

Mr. RIXEY. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Certainly, sir; with much pleasure.

Mr. RIXEY. I do not understand this motion is to strike out anything.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Without limitation, I said.

Mr. RIXEY. Let me call your attention simply to this: No part of the money is to be spent until an estimate is prepared and presented to Congress or the Department. Now, that estimate can be made by the 1st of July. I suggest to my colleague upon the committee that it would be well to have an estimate as to what this basin will cost. I do not think the appropriation ought to be held up.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I think if my colleague had listened to what I said—

Mr. RIXEY. I did listen.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I made that portion very clear indeed. I object to a limitation of this kind on this appropriation. Here we are confined to consider whether an appropriation is wise that requires an expenditure of a certain amount of money before the Government could receive any benefit from that expended, or only a partial benefit from it. But limitations of this kind are used from the very condition of this reserve basin, from any expenditure of money made. The maximum of benefit is received, as it is from our additional expenditure, so that the Department is satisfied, is contented, to leave it to the wisdom of Congress as to how much they will appropriate, knowing full well that not one dollar can be unwisely expended, because it can be made useful by the natural conditions surrounding the place.

Mr. RIXEY. Will not my colleague on the Naval Committee agree with me that Congress ought to have an estimate of what will be the total cost of this improvement?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I do not think that is wise in this condition. I have so stated it twice, because of the very reason that if you appropriate a hundred thousand dollars you can immediately receive the benefit of that \$100,000 as soon as it is expended; and so from each particular appropriation, if it is necessary that you expend a million, you can receive the maximum benefit by every appropriation.

Mr. RIXEY. My colleague will understand that I do not favor holding up the appropriation at all, but I do think this—

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Will the gentleman pardon me a moment? My colleague has been there?

Mr. RIXEY. I have.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. You have seen that ground and you certainly know that in the building up of that reserve basin fifty, sixty, or seventy-five thousand dollars can be expended with economy.

Mr. RIXEY. Will my friend allow me? According to the statement of the gentleman from New York—and I confess that, although a member of the committee, I was surprised at the statement—we have already spent on that project over \$1,000,000. He says that the hearing shows that it will take from fifteen to twenty years to complete this improvement. We have never had an estimate as to what the total cost will be. Now, it does seem to me that we ought to have such an estimate; not, however, to delay the appropriation. We can not get an estimate by a separate provision in this bill because it would be legislation and subject to a point of order, and the only way is to provide a limitation on this appropriation. The amendment appears a reasonable one. It does not delay the appropriation, but simply calls upon the Navy Department to furnish us with an estimate of the total cost.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, over twenty-five years ago the city of Philadelphia purchased League Island, containing over 800 acres of land, at an expense of nearly half a million of dollars, and presented it to the United States Government with the understanding that it was to be developed into

a first-class navy-yard. For many years no steps were taken by the Government toward the fulfillment of this promise. During all that time the yard at New York was being built up and put in its present stage of efficiency. So I think it comes with very ill grace from the representatives of that city that now the yard at Philadelphia, which does not conflict in any way with the yard at New York, because the purposes of the two yards are entirely distinct and apart, should be cut out from the promised development by placing this limitation upon the appropriation. This yard at Philadelphia possesses the advantages of this fresh water for a laying-up station, and the most valuable part of that yard, for which this appropriation is intended, has been denied by the gentleman from New York.

Why, Mr. Chairman, when the Spanish war broke out the monitors that have been used in the civil war and had been stored up there for nearly forty years, so far as their hulls were concerned, were in sound condition, and were brought out, refitted inside with new machinery, and put into commission for harbor defense during that war.

Now, sir, as has already been stated by the gentleman from New Jersey, nearly a million dollars have been expended for the purpose, in the New York Navy-Yard, for which this appropriation is made; and I take it that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] raised no point as to estimates being made in order to delay or hinder that work. I say it comes with ill grace from New York, which has received so much at the hands of the Government, and whose yard has been so fully developed, to try to hinder or delay in any way the development of this yard which the Government has recently taken up and is now putting in process of completion.

As far as concerns the other items which he includes under his restraining order, the retaining walls and other things, they are equally important in the development of this yard.

I trust, sir, that this hindrance which the gentleman tries to put in the way of the development of this yard will not meet with the approval of this House. This navy-yard is now approaching a condition where its usefulness is being fully developed, and in a few years, with further moderate appropriations, it will be in a state to fulfill the great purpose for which the Government is trying to fit it.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. I agree with everything that has been said by the gentleman from New Jersey touching the importance of having this fresh-water basin at League Island. It is the central feature of that yard, and it seems to me that that feature is one of the most important in the naval establishment, at least so far as the Atlantic coast is concerned. At the same time, we can not commit ourselves to any great scheme of determining what that basin shall be. As it is now it is partially made. We can add to it as the necessities require, and as we ought to add to it. It is certainly not the part of wisdom to attempt either to retard the development of this basin, according to the needs and necessities of the service, nor to attempt to lay down at this time for the future the extent to which that basin shall be enlarged.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAYTON. Why, certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman know how large this basin is to be?

Mr. DAYTON. Why, nobody knows how large this basin is to be. It will be just as large as Congress authorizes it to be, and no larger.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Has the gentleman any idea how large it should be?

Mr. DAYTON. That is just precisely what I am talking about. We have not the information before us to tell how large it should be. The future will develop that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman not aware that this amendment will simply require the Department to state about how large it thinks this basin should be and about how much it will cost?

Mr. DAYTON. I do not want the Department to state how large they think it ought to be, because they can not tell and we can not tell. It will depend upon the future exigencies of the service. It should be large enough and not too large, and we are more apt to estimate for a larger basin than will be required than to underestimate it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman answer another question?

Mr. DAYTON. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman afraid to have the Department submit an estimate of what it will cost to complete this?

Mr. DAYTON. Why, not at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is he not afraid the amount will be so great that even he will be compelled to oppose it?

Mr. DAYTON. Not at all; not any more than I am afraid for them to submit their estimates upon any other proposition. But it is not necessary to submit their estimates upon a proposition that is not demanded and may never be required. This basin can be extended from year to year as the requirements make it necessary, and Congress and the Department will be able to estimate what these conditions are from year to year. It is wholly unnecessary to estimate what the future will require, because neither the Department nor anybody else will be able to tell what that requirement may be.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I submit to my colleague that this is nothing more than a storehouse for ships, and as we build ships we can increase the size of the storehouse.

Mr. DAYTON. To put such a limitation on this is to make an invidious distinction as to this work, compared with all the other works that are being done in the Navy.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this discussion has been very illuminating. It has been instructive, not only so far as this project is concerned, but so far as it shows the conception some gentlemen have as to their duty regarding various items in the bill.

Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that I am not opposed to the building of this fresh-water pond to store up obsolete ships of the Navy. Perhaps it may be necessary to have some place where they will be safe some day. I am not opposing yet the amount appropriated in this bill for the continuation of this work. My amendment merely proposes to require the Secretary of the Navy to submit an estimate of the completed cost of this fresh-water pond. Why do I do that? I have made an exhaustive examination of the appropriation acts for ten years, and I find that in that time there has been expended for this purpose \$1,289,920. I find in the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs the statement by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks that this is a progressive improvement, and that it will take from fifteen to twenty years more to complete it.

Let me call the attention of the committee to the manner in which this improvement has progressed. In 1903 \$50,000 was appropriated to build the retaining wall and \$25,000 for dredging. In 1904 \$50,000 was appropriated for the retaining wall and \$25,000 for dredging. For the present fiscal year \$80,000 was appropriated for the retaining wall and \$30,000 for dredging. In this bill \$100,000 is provided for the retaining wall and \$75,000 to dredge.

Gentlemen say they are extending this basin as the necessities of the service require. Why, there has never been during the ten years in which they have been digging this pond to store modern war ships—there has never been a day that a modern war ship was in it. This committee has gone on blindly in this matter. It now antagonizes a simple amendment to find out what is in the minds of the Bureau officers as to the extent it is intended to build this beautiful fresh-water pond at Philadelphia.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention further to the manner in which this \$75,000 and \$30,000 additional for dredging in the Delaware River was allowed. Last year the committee allowed \$80,000 and \$30,000; this year \$100,000 and \$75,000, and an additional \$30,000. The committee states that it desired to be economical in the framing of this bill. Here is an estimate of \$100,000 for a retaining wall and \$75,000 for dredging. The hearings show that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] asked this question: "Can you economically spend another \$100,000 this year?" Answer: "Yes; I can." And upon that statement, which would be made by every Government official asking money from the committee appropriating it, they gave an increase of \$20,000 for the retaining-wall purposes and \$45,000 for dredging purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time of the gentleman will be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not antagonistic to this basin. Some basin may be necessary, but with the information before the committee it is time to find out just what the Department desires to do in extending this basin. This House and Congress will not be bound by any estimates submitted by the Secretary. He will indicate how large this basin should be in his judgment and how much it will cost to complete it; then the committee, with that information before it, would be able to determine just how large it would have the basin and just how much it would eventually expend upon it.

The amendment submitted by me does not withhold the expenditure of the appropriation. It merely requires the Secre-



tary—and that is the only form in which it can be submitted—to have prepared ready for submission to Congress an estimate of what it will cost to complete this basin before he expends any of the money appropriated under this item.

I submit that, as wise legislators, as men anxious to serve the best public interests, with this knowledge that in ten years there has been expended twelve hundred thousand dollars, and that it will be necessary to keep up the expenditures, increasing year by year, for twenty years more, it is time to know where and when this project will stop.

Gentlemen have referred to the fact that they are surprised, because I come from a section of the country where there is a navy-yard, that I should point out what I believed to be vicious legislation affecting some other navy-yards. Mr. Chairman, I have never in this House advocated any measure for the improvement of the yard at New York which, in my judgment, was not warranted. I never attributed to anybody improper motives because they have opposed appropriations for that yard. I believe that some of the money expended for dredging in New York has not been wisely expended. I will say in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he and his fellow-citizens evidently appreciate a good bargain, for in giving this \$500,000 island to the United States Government for the purpose of being converted into a naval station they have obtained as a return the expenditure in sixteen years of \$7,386,000 at that station. I do not say it has not been necessary; but I do say that, in my judgment, this amendment is good legislation and should prevail.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be voted down. Admiral Endicott was before the committee and stated that the dredging and sea-wall work on that basin has been necessary, and he said: "I think the time is coming when a great many of those vessels will have to be laid up, and we have to have space there and wharfage and storage there." It is the only navy-yard in the North where there is a fresh-water basin. It is a very large basin, which will accommodate forty or fifty ships, and it is the only fresh-water basin we have got in the country anywhere. I do not know how much it will be necessary to enlarge it in the future, but we have appropriated as the necessities have required, as the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] has stated, and I trust that this amendment will be voted down at this time, and I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 36, yeas 73.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In line 23, page 28, strike out "one hundred" and insert "eighty," and in line 5, page 29, strike out "seventy-five" and insert "thirty." I will offer that as one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, in line 23, strike out "one hundred" and insert "eighty," so as to read: "to continue retaining wall about reserve basin, \$80,000;" and on page 29, in lines 5 and 6, strike out "seventy-five" and insert "thirty," so as to read "thirty thousand dollars."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to state in reference to this amendment that the amounts I have moved to substitute are the amounts allowed for the present fiscal year. They were \$35,000 more than the amounts allowed for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904. The only evidence before the committee is the statement of the Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks that it could be economically expended during the coming year. This money is expended under contract. It is simply a question of how much money will be given, as to how much money will be expended by contract, and as this committee has been animated so much by the spirit of economy and the desire to keep the bill down to small limits, endeavoring to keep it below \$100,000,000, I trust that it will accept this small amendment to save \$85,000, which could just as easily be expended at any other time during the coming twenty years during which they will be at work on this fresh-water basin.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is a common saying that "if you scratch a Russian you will find a Tartar." The gentleman from New York in his pathetic appeal to this House said that he had no antagonism to the navy-yard at League Island and only wished to offer his

amendment so as to have an estimate that we may know from his standpoint the business reasons and the total cost of this improvement, and when he has failed to convince the House of the advisability of that he at once arises and moves to cut down the estimate for the League Island Navy-Yard, and, as I say, showing the real motive that actuated the gentleman. If his motive was simply to get an estimate for the completion of the full work on this basin it could not be done, Mr. Chairman, because the size of this basin, looking to the future, must be in proportion to the United States Navy and the number of ships that are to be laid up there, and it would be false economy and a very unwise procedure to limit the size of this basin unless at the same time he puts in an amendment limiting the future development of the United States Navy, and that is the reason why the project of the gentleman could not be carried out.

I am glad that the gentleman, like the Russian, has shown the Tartar of his animus.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman not know that if I were opposed to the basin I would move to strike out the entire appropriation?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. No; because the gentleman knows he could not carry it, and, like the Tartar, he is devious in his ways and trying to accomplish as much as he can.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla.: Central power house (to complete), \$44,500; tools for yards and docks, \$2,000; water system, \$10,000; fire-protection system, \$5,000; closets and lavatories, \$3,500; garbage crematory, \$7,500; machinery for central power house (to cost \$120,000), \$50,000; naval prison, \$20,000; railroad track and equipment, \$10,000; telephone system, extensions, \$2,000; elevator for building No. 1, \$1,000; in all, navy-yard, Pensacola, \$155,500.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the provision for a naval prison, \$20,000, in line 8. I submit that that is not a part of the equipment of a navy-yard. It is an authorization for a naval prison. I submit that it comes within the ruling made a few years since holding that it was improper to appropriate for a barracks at a navy-yard.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard?

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, it is a part of the naval establishment. A naval prison is as much a part of the naval establishment as any other building or any other institution connected with the Navy. We have two at the present time, one at Portsmouth and one at Boston, and they are both of them in the navy-yards, on land owned by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the decisions on this point are very numerous and point both ways, but the tendency of the decisions recently made has been to sustain the point of order. The Chair feels constrained to do the same. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, New Orleans, La.: Improvement of water front, \$50,000; levee improvement and grading, \$10,000; paving, \$10,000; sewer system, extensions, \$5,000; water system, extensions, \$5,000; machinery and tools for yards and docks shop, \$5,000; fire-protection system, \$10,000; in all, navy-yard, New Orleans, \$95,000.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, during the past session of Congress the Department started out to develop a naval station at Guantanamo, on the island of Cuba. According to the programme we were to pay to the Cuban Republic \$137,000, which we were to get back in the rental we were to pay of \$2,000 a year. Under the terms of the contract the Republic of Cuba was to secure the title to the property from the individual owners. It appears from a letter from the Department, which I will insert, that the island of Cuba has not perfected its title to this property, and as a consequence this Government has only paid about \$35,000 of the \$137,000. During the past session of Congress an appropriation was carried in the naval bill of \$200,000 for the purpose of building a dry dock at Guantanamo on the island.

In the hearings before the committee it appeared that no contract had been made for this dry dock for two reasons, as I understand. First, doubt was expressed as to whether Guantanamo was the proper place for a great naval station; and, second, because the Republic of Cuba had not secured title. At least one bureau chief gave it as his opinion that it was not a proper place for a great naval station, because it could never be properly fortified. Some members of the committee who visited

Cuba and Guantanamo were of the opinion that it could not be fortified—could not be defended—and that no great naval station should be established there, and that the dry dock ought not to be built there. I am at liberty to refer in this connection to the opinion of my colleague upon the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER], who visited that locality and gave it as his opinion, and I take it he may be regarded as an authority, that Guantanamo could never be properly fortified and defended. I take it that it is for these reasons that no contract has been made for the building of the dry dock, and the \$200,000 appropriated during the past year has not been expended. I call attention of the committee to the further fact that the present bill carries no appropriation for the Guantanamo site. Under these circumstances, and, in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Navy when he came before the Naval Committee stated that, unless some provision was carried in this bill indicating that the House did not want to go on with the development of that station and did not want the contract made for the dry dock, he would feel compelled, under the authority given him at the past session of Congress in the last bill, to make the contract for the dry dock, I am constrained, Mr. Chairman, to offer an amendment, which I think will indicate to the Secretary that it is the opinion of this House that he should not proceed further with the contract for the dry dock at Guantanamo.

I will print as part of my remarks the following letter:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 14, 1905.

SIR: The naval reservation at Guantanamo Bay was surveyed by a joint commission composed of Señor Premelles, on the part of Cuba, and Rear-Admiral Coghlan, on the part of the United States. The land and improvements were valued by the Cuban commission as follows:

El Cuzco	\$35,577.55
El Ocuja	24,572.02
Mata Abajo	21,715.96
El Cuero	36,360.16
El Bouqueron	6,274.60
Buildings about Fisherman's Point	2,456.02
Light-house and aids to navigation	10,465.40
Total	137,421.71

The Cuban Government turned over to the United States authorities all of this property with the exception of El Bouqueron, a portion of which estate was owned by a railroad company, which company was not willing to be dispossessed of its property at the valuation given by the Cuban commission. The question was turned over to the Cuban courts and as yet has not been settled. The titles of the property known as the El Cuzco estate have been turned over to the Department, and its value paid to the Cuban Government. The Cuban Government has also been informed that the money to pay for the remaining estate is available, but as yet no further request has been made for additional payments. It is believed that the Cuban authorities are settling the question of titles, but the owners of the estates, with the exception of El Bouqueron, have signified their willingness to accept the valuation as given by the Cuban commission mentioned.

Very respectfully,

Secretary.

Hon. G. E. Foss,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, with this statement I now withdraw the pro forma amendment and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia withdraws his pro forma amendment and offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 20, page 33, insert:  
"Naval station, Guantanamo, Cuba: The unexpended balance on July 1, 1905, of the \$200,000 heretofore appropriated for a dry dock is hereby directed to be covered into the Treasury."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, before the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY] is submitted I wish to offer an amendment to the paragraph on which the gentleman was speaking.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] can offer his amendment now, which the Clerk will report. The other amendment will be disposed of afterwards.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 33, lines 13 and 14, strike out "improvement of water front, \$50,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is a new improvement authorized at a navy-yard, which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] stated a day or two ago would not be incorporated in this bill. There is no real necessity for this improvement, because it appears from the hearings before the Naval Committee that they seldom send a ship to this naval station. It further appears that there is only one bureau of the Navy Department which is able to do repair work at that station. The Bureau of Construction and Repair alone is equipped to do repair work there.

I call the attention of the committee to the fact that this is designated as "naval station," and it appears in the hearings before the committee that there is a distinction between naval stations and navy-yards. Navy-yards are well-equipped plants where

repair work of the Navy can properly be done; naval stations are embryonic navy-yards—places which are in the process of equipment for the purpose of doing repair work.

At this session it seems that the committee desires to economize. It is anxious to keep the appropriations down. There is no immediate necessity for this improvement. The naval service will not be affected if it be not authorized, and I therefore submit that this is another good place for the committee to apply the knife and to economize and save some money to the Government. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss]?

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for the reading of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY].

The Clerk reread the amendment.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the appropriation bill of last year we established a naval station at Guantanamo, Cuba. Among the appropriations that were made at that time was this appropriation for a dry dock, \$200,000, without any qualification or limitation whatever. Now the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY] seeks by this amendment to change existing law. Part of that appropriation has been expended.

Mr. RIXEY. No; not at all.

Mr. FOSS. Well, whether it has been or not it makes no difference whatever.

Mr. RIXEY. There have been no contracts made, either.

Mr. FOSS. It was an appropriation that was made without any condition or qualification, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY] can not now at this late day change or divert the purposes of the appropriation as originally made without change of existing law.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to page 352 of the Manual, the third paragraph from the bottom.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY] refer to the paragraph relating to reappropriation of an unexpended balance?

Mr. RIXEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This is not a reappropriation. It is turning into the Treasury an appropriation already made.

Mr. RIXEY. Is not that reappropriation? It is directing that it shall be paid into the Treasury. It is diverting it from the course for which it was appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the question raised by this amendment and the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] seem to be entirely new. There is no precedent at all.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD].

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, there was a somewhat similar point of order decided, if I recollect right, in the Fifty-fifth Congress. I remember at one session of that Congress, upon an amendment offered by myself, an appropriation was made of \$500,000 for the construction of buildings at the Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Md. In a subsequent session—I can not recall the language of the provision—the chairman of the committee, the late Mr. Boutelle, of Maine, offered a proposition which contemplated the nonexpenditure of the money, and provided further for an investigation by a commission into the needs of the academy and other matters therein referred to. There was an elaborate discussion as to this provision upon a point of order, similar to the one now made, under section 2 of Rule XXI of the rules. I think it was practically an analogous case to the one now presented. After the discussion, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], I think, being in the chair, the point of order made by myself was sustained upon the ground, as set forth at some length by the then occupant of the chair, that the provision changed existing law. The suspension of the appropriation or the rendering inoperative the appropriation, as proposed by this amendment, is, in my judgment, clearly a change of existing law.

A provision for an appropriation of money, while it does not say, and it is not necessary to say, specifically that the money shall be expended, is, of course, an order that the money shall be expended. To appropriate the money, though no more language be used than that necessary to make the appropriation, is an authorization to expend the money. It is, in effect, to say to the Department: "This money Congress authorizes and directs you to expend in a certain way." It does not, as a general



thing, require the Departments to expend it in a particular time, but carries unquestionably an authorization; and the giving of an authorization is law, is making law; and that in this case law is repealed if the amendment now offered is adopted.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think the present occupant of the chair has held that an appropriation for a dock at a naval station is a provision of law. If the Chair will bear with me one minute, when this item was reached in the bill last year no point of order was made. We all anticipated if the point of order had been made that provision would have gone from the bill. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation to provide for the creation of this dock which is not held to be a necessary part of a naval station—to take it out would necessarily be legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not seem to the Chair that the provision in the last appropriation bill upon this subject is existing law in the sense that the amendment would come within the provision of Rule XXI. The Chair can see no reason why an unexpended balance can not be reappropriated, as, in point of fact, is proposed in this case. Instead of appropriating the money to the dock at Guantanamo, it is proposed to cover it into the Treasury of the United States. If it is competent to divert an appropriation already made for one purpose to another purpose, it is equally competent to divert an appropriation made for a certain purpose back again into the United States Treasury. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOSS. I call for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 45, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, Olongapo, P. I.: Repairs to existing buildings, \$25,000; drainage canal, to complete, \$25,000; water system, to extend, \$20,000; roads and bridges, \$5,000; sewer system, \$15,000; tools for general use, \$2,000; hoisting machinery, \$4,000; rock crusher and appurtenances, \$4,000; in all, \$100,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 33, line 25, the words "Repairs to existing buildings, \$25,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 25, strike out "Repairs to existing buildings, \$25,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it seems that at this station at Olongapo, P. I., there are a number of buildings erected by the Spaniards for temporary occupancy. This appropriation is intended to permit repairs of those buildings. In the appropriation act for the present fiscal year there is also contained an appropriation of \$25,000 for the same purpose. It seems to me that if we are to continue from year to year to expend \$25,000 in repairs upon buildings which were erected merely for temporary purposes it would be much better to discontinue the use of those buildings entirely. In the appropriation act for the present year there is \$862,395 appropriated for this station at Olongapo. In addition there is in this bill, on the very next page, an item of \$500,000 placed at the disposal of the Chief of this Bureau for repairs and for maintaining in proper condition navy-yards and stations. I can see no reason why any repairs necessary to these buildings should not be made from the general appropriation contained in the next page; and I add that it seems unwise to continue appropriations for repairs of buildings erected for temporary purposes and not much value to the Government.

Mr. FOSS. I call for a vote.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 24 and 25, on page 33, and lines 1 to 7, on page 34.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the whole of the paragraph, beginning with lines 24 and 25, on page 33, and from line 1 to line 7, on page 34.

[Mr. BAKER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Buildings and grounds, Naval Academy: Toward the construction of buildings, and for other necessary improvements at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., as authorized by the acts of Congress approved June 7, 1900, and March 3, 1903, \$800,000.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the committee, a question that refers

to this item. In the plan adopted, I think two or three years ago, it limited the cost of the new buildings to \$10,000,000?

Mr. FOSS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Was any definite plan or scheme adopted for the rehabilitation of this institution?

Mr. MUDD. There was a plan adopted for these buildings.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Were the buildings named in the statute authorizing the construction of the building?

Mr. MUDD. Not in the statute; the provision under which the authorization was made required that the Secretary should adopt a complete plan before proceeding with the buildings. That complete plan, under that authorization, was adopted and designated the buildings.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Was that the plan known as the "Flagg plan?"

Mr. MUDD. I so understand.

Mr. SOUTHARD. None of the buildings included in the Flagg plan were dropped out of this estimate of \$10,000,000?

Mr. MUDD. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. SOUTHARD. All of these buildings are now under contract?

Mr. MUDD. Nearly all of them that have not been completed. I think there is a statement in the hearings by the Superintendent of the Academy showing the buildings not as yet under contract. On page 287 of the hearings there is a statement to the effect that the only buildings not under contract to-day are the administration building, which will cost forty or forty-five thousand dollars; the power house and shops; and I find later on it is said that the gymnasium has not been contracted for. Outside of these minor buildings all the rest have been constructed or are under contract and advancing with satisfactory progress.

Mr. SOUTHARD. The \$10,000,000 is intended to carry out and complete the plan adopted by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. MUDD. For completing the plan adopted by the Secretary in pursuance of the authorization of Congress.

Mr. SOUTHARD. And this \$800,000 is necessary to carry out the authorization?

Mr. MUDD. Yes.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval War College, Rhode Island, buildings: For furniture for officers' quarters in building No. 10, formerly belonging to training station, \$2,000; for alterations to main war college building to improve lecture room, provide more committee rooms and offices, new entrance in rear, and change main stairway, repairs to and painting of main building, repairs to electric installations, and providing new feeder from generator station, \$3,000; in all, \$5,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee whether in the appropriation act for the present fiscal year provision is not made for furnishing the officers' quarters formerly belonging to the training station? I find in the appropriation act for the present fiscal year this language:

Altering building formerly belonging to the training station, fitting the same for occupancy by officers of War College, \$6,500. Furniture for the extension of War College, \$1,625.

Is there not included in this item furniture for which provision is evidently made in this bill?

Mr. FOSS. I think not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman able to state that the appropriation bill for the present fiscal year which carries an item of \$6,500 for fitting this building for the purpose of being utilized by the officers, is not in a measure duplicated here?

Mr. FOSS. I am not able to hear the gentleman by reason of so much confusion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this language in the appropriation bill for the present fiscal year:

Altering the building formerly belonging to the training station, fitting the same for occupancy by officers of the War College, \$6,500.

Does not that provide for the furnishing?

Mr. FOSS. If it did, it is not sufficient this year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of lines 6 and 7, page 36.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 36 strike out lines 6 and 7, "for furniture of officers' quarters in the building numbered 10, formerly belonging to the training station, \$2,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do that, Mr. Chairman, because I find in the appropriation act for the present fiscal year an item which apparently covers this same provision, and unless the gentleman from Illinois knows that the item in his bill is necessary and should be made, it seems to me it is a good thing to strike it out.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between the two items; the item in the last year's bill provided for altering the building and fitting the same for occupancy, referring to a change in construction of the building. It did not provide furniture or anything of that sort. This provides for the furniture. The other related to the alterations and change of the building. I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

Construction and repair of vessels: For preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary; purchase of materials and stores of all kinds; steam steerers, pneumatic steerers, steam capstans, steam windlasses, and all other auxiliaries; labor in navy-yards and on foreign stations; purchase of machinery and tools for use in shops; carrying on work of experimental model tank; designing naval vessels; construction and repair of yard craft, lighters, and barges; wear, tear, and repair of vessels afloat; general care, increase, and protection of the Navy in the line of construction and repair; incidental expenses for vessels and navy-yards, inspectors' offices, and bureaus, such as advertising, foreign postage, telegrams, telephone service, photographing, books, professional magazines, plans, stationery, and instruments for drafting room, \$7,800,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be applied to the repair of any wooden ship, when the estimated cost of such repairs, to be appraised by a competent board of naval officers, shall exceed 10 per cent of the estimated cost, appraised in like manner of a new ship of the same size and like material.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I find that the language in this provision is different from that contained in previous appropriation acts, and I wish to reserve a point of order, if necessary. It is the language commencing on line 17, with the word "construction," down to the word "barges," in line 18. That language is new in this bill, because it is different from that contained in any other appropriation bill. In all other appropriation bills the language "at home stations" is contained, and this is to enable this Bureau to carry on work at stations outside of the limits of the United States.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, before replying to that, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Chairman, before we finish the consideration of this bill to-day, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], if he will kindly inform the House whether or not the information has been received from the Secretary of the Treasury in response to the resolution adopted by the House?

Mr. FOSS. In reference to what particular matter?

Mr. VANDIVER. In reference to contracts that had been let for armor plate. It is important that we have that information before this bill is finished.

Mr. FOSS. I would state to the gentleman that I have not received the information up to this hour, but I think we may receive it by Monday, when I purpose finishing the consideration of this bill, if possible.

Mr. VANDIVER. Is it not intended to finish the bill to-morrow?

Mr. FOSS. I understand that we will go over until Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18467, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. HILL of Mississippi, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 6418. An act granting an increase of pension to Wallace Goff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6432. An act granting an increase of pension to James Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6440. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6441. An act granting an increase of pension to John Selby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6442. An act granting an increase of pension to William Southwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6466. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Kennedy—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 6467. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Story—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 6471. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6472. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6484. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6556. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda B. Mack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6562. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Moyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6576. An act granting an increase of pension to Carrie M. Cleveland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6578. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6579. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Foley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6580. An act granting an increase of pension to Melissa E. Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6661. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6675. An act granting an increase of pension to Halsey S. Curry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6676. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Hopson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6681. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Kiser—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 6698. An act granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6706. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Ormerod—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6727. An act granting an increase of pension to Simeon Perry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6749. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred Diehl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6762. An act granting an increase of pension to David Wertz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6847. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Dunn—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 6896. An act granting an increase of pension to William Gleason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6897. An act granting an increase of pension to James Flanagan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6898. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wood, alias Joseph Rule—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6901. An act granting an increase of pension to Allen Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6921. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6922. An act granting a pension to Sarah Ferry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6924. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard H. McIntire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6925. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura C. Curtiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6938. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick W. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6939. An act granting an increase of pension to John Coborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6940. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Enyart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6943. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6946. An act granting an increase of pension to Judson L. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6948. An act granting an increase of pension to Bradford Burnham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6966. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter A. Purdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6989. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob O. Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6993. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen B. Messenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7019. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie T. Seaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7034. An act granting an increase of pension to John Q. A. Foss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7056. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha Haddock—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 7064. An act granting an increase of pension to Esther S. Damon—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 7066. An act granting an increase of pension to Edmond W. Eakin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7076. An act granting a pension to Susan Hayman—to the Committee on Pensions.



S. 7093. An act granting an increase of pension to William Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7095. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Duff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7096. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda H. Burrows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7124. An act granting an increase of pension to Harris Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7125. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Cousins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7155. An act granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Worth Bagley—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 101. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Shippee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 107. An act granting an increase of pension to Joel H. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6009. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6010. An act granting an increase of pension to Justus A. Chafee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6045. An act granting an increase of pension to Almon W. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6075. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6076. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6096. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Grass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6099. An act granting an increase of pension to Dempsey Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6185. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Read—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 6354. An act granting an increase of pension to Pierce McKeogh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6357. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvan P. Granger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6374. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis Secor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6388. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Hadlock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6415. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bolen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5108. An act to amend an act for the prevention of smoke in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved February 2, 1899—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 6015. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ritchie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6804. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Leefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6492. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3406. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda D. Penick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7148. An act to grant certain lands to the State of Ohio—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 7173. An act to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 6443. An act granting an increase of pension to Terence J. Tully, alias James Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7021. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine R. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 202. An act granting a pension to Harriet E. Penrose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6859. An act granting an increase of pension to Lizzie D. Wise—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 6743. An act granting a pension to Joseph A. Aldrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6701. An act granting a pension to Charles B. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6571. An act granting an increase of pension to John Van Lear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6515. An act granting an increase of pension to George Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6477. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice S. Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6417. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucy F. Cruttenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5973. An act granting a pension to Jane N. Clements—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5909. An act granting a pension to Russell A. McKinley—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 5405. An act granting an increase of pension to John Leary—to the Committee on Pensions.

Senate concurrent resolution 101:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Committee on Printing of the Senate, with two Members of the present House of Representatives who are reelected to the next Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or any subcommittee of said special joint committee, are hereby authorized to examine into the numbers printed of the various documents, reports, bills, and other papers published by order of Congress, or of either House thereof, and of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if, in their judgment, the conditions as they find them warrant remedial legislation to report a bill at the next session of Congress making such reductions in the numbers and cost of printing and such changes and reduction in the distribution of said publications as they may deem expedient, with a report giving their reasons therefor; and that the said committee is also authorized to investigate the printing and binding for the Executive Departments executed at the Government Printing Office and at the branch printing offices and binderies in the various Departments, and if, in their judgment, the conditions as they find them warrant remedial legislation, to report a bill at the next session of Congress, making such reductions in expenses and imposing such checks as they may deem expedient, with a report giving their reasons therefor; and said committee is further authorized to make any other investigation calculated, in their opinion, to reduce the cost of the public printing, and report the result thereof; and in making the inquiries required by this resolution said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer to report its hearings, to call on the heads of Executive Departments and the Public Printer for such information in regard to the preceding matters as they may desire, to do whatever is necessary for a thorough investigation of the subject, and to sit during the recess of Congress. Any subcommittee may exercise the powers hereby granted to said committee, and the expenses of said investigation shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers duly approved by the chairman of the Committee on Printing and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Rules.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13640. An act granting an increase of pension to Eugene Hepp.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. SLEMP to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of George P. Larkin, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF FRANCES E. WILLARD.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Friday, February 17:* On motion of Mr. FOSS, by unanimous consent, *Resolved*, That the exercises appropriate to the reception and acceptance from the State of Illinois of the statue of Frances E. Willard, erected in Statuary Hall, in the Capitol, be made the special order for Friday, February 17, at 4 o'clock.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Clerk to read the communication which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
Springfield, February 16, 1905.

*To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:* By authority of the act of the general assembly of Illinois the governor of Illinois heretofore appointed Anna E. Gordon, Mary E. Metzgar, John J. Mitchell, W. R. Jewell, and Mrs. S. M. D. Fry to constitute a commission to procure a statue of Frances E. Willard for erection in Statuary Hall, in the Capitol at Washington, D. C.

I am informed by the commissioners that the statue was made by Helen F. Mears, of New York City; that it is completed and has been placed in position and is now ready to be presented to Congress.

I have been further informed by Miss Anna E. Gordon, chairman of the commissioners, that a resolution is to be presented accepting said statue. As governor of the State of Illinois, therefore, I have the honor to present to the Government of the United States the statue hereinbefore referred to.

Very respectfully,

CHAS. S. DENEEN,  
Governor of Illinois.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask that it be considered as pending.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the statue of Frances E. Willard, presented by the State of Illinois, to be placed in Statuary Hall, be accepted by the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the statue of one of the most eminent women of the United States.

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions, duly authenticated, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Illinois.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, Congress, on July 2, 1864, passed a law authorizing the President to invite all the States to provide and furnish statues in marble or bronze, not exceeding two in number for each State, of deceased persons who have been citizens thereof and illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service, such as each State may deem to be worthy of this national commemoration, and when

so furnished the same shall be placed in the old Hall of the House of Representatives in the Capitol of the United States, which is set apart, or so much thereof as may be necessary, as a National Statuary Hall.

In pursuance of this nineteen States have presented statues of illustrious citizens; fourteen States have filled their quota: Massachusetts, Winthrop and Adams.

New Hampshire, Stark and Webster.

Vermont, Collamer and Allen.

Rhode Island, Greene and Williams.

Connecticut, Sherman and Trumbull.

New York, Clinton and Livingston.

New Jersey, Stockton and Kearney.

Pennsylvania, Fulton and Muhlenberg.

Maryland, Carroll and Hanson.

West Virginia, Kenna and Pierpont.

Ohio, Allen and Garfield.

Missouri, Benton and Blair.

Texas, Houston and Austin.

Maine, King.

Indiana, Morton.

Michigan, Cass.

Wisconsin, Marquette.

Kansas, Ingalls.

Illinois has her Shields, and now presents the statue of Frances E. Willard, one of the foremost women of her time.

The following act was passed by the legislature of Illinois with practical unanimity on February 28, 1899, and signed by the governor:

Whereas Congress has invited each State of the Union to furnish statues in marble or bronze of two of its deceased citizens, illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service, and deemed worthy of national commemoration, and to have the same placed in the National Statuary Hall, in the Capitol, at Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the State of Illinois has furnished but one of its statues, and before the close of this century it should complete the number allotted to it; and

Whereas Illinois has been noted for its illustrious warriors, jurists, and statesmen—Grant, Shields, Logan, Palmer, McClernard, Davis, Trumbull, Breese, Scofield, McAllister, Lincoln, Douglas, Yates, Lovejoy, and countless others, like McDougal and Baker, who won fame in other States; and

Whereas the fame of none of these was more heroically won or more richly deserved than that of one of our deceased citizens, illustrious for historic renown and distinguished for civic service in Europe and America in a new, unexplored field of Christian endeavor, the effect of whose efforts and achievements and the influence of whose spotless life and sublime example has been so marked that the world has wondered and admired the author, organizer, and advocate of purity and temperance, Illinois's most illustrious deceased citizen, Frances E. Willard, the uncrowned queen of purity and temperance, whose ashes repose in peace on the shores of Lake Michigan at Evanston, Ill. Her life, like that of her Redeemer, was devoted to the spiritual welfare of mankind, and the world at large has been materially benefited by her prayers and sacrifices. Radiant with a halo of all the virtues, her face shone with the light of intelligence. Her marvelous abilities energized all around and about her, while her gentleness, tact, and self-sacrificing spirit calmed every storm that rose in the councils which were graced and blessed by her presence. Her grand life is a "beacon light" to the good and the true of all sexes, races, and creeds in the civilized world, and her wonderful achievements are lights and landmarks on the cliffs of fame, which will for all time illumine the paths of millions of women wherever civilization has a footing, which is where woman is duly appreciated; and

Whereas the priceless heritage of such a life belongs of right to Illinois; and

Whereas she glories in it, and deems it "worthy of national commemoration;" Therefore,

To immortalize it, and to show all nations how exalted a sphere woman occupies in this great State, the following law is hereby placed upon our statute books:

"An act to select commissioners to expend not to exceed \$9,000 in purchasing a heroic bronze or marble statue of the late Frances E. Willard, and to provide a pedestal to be appropriately inscribed and ornamented, and also to defray the expense of transporting the same to Washington, D. C., when completed, and erecting it in the National Statuary Hall, at Washington, D. C.

"SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois represented in the general assembly, That five persons, to be selected by the governor of the State, be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered, as commissioners, to purchase a heroic statue of the late Frances E. Willard, to be cast in standard bronze metal or marble, and a pedestal or base for the same, and also to defray the cost and expenses of transporting them, when completed, to Washington, D. C., and erecting them in the National Statuary Hall at the Capitol, said commissioners shall not hereby be empowered to obligate the State of Illinois to pay any amount in excess of the sum stated in section 3 of this act.

"SEC. 2. Said commissioners are to receive no pay nor compensation of any kind for their services in the fulfillment of duties required of them by this act.

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of defraying the cost of said statue, pedestal, and all other costs and obligations hereinbefore stated and set forth, or incident thereto, the sum of \$9,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of the State treasury, and the auditor of public accounts is hereby required to draw his warrant on the treasurer of the State for such sum as may be expended, upon bills of particulars, to be approved of by the governor."

The commissioners appointed by the governor were Miss Anna A. Gordon, Evanston; J. J. Mitchell, Chicago; Mrs.

Susanna M. D. Fry, Evanston; W. R. Jewell, Danville, and Mrs. Mary E. Metzgar, Moline.

The commissioners awarded the execution of the statue to Helen Farnsworth Mears, and she has brought out in Carrara marble the refined womanliness, the nobility and strength of character, the sweetness and simplicity, and the intense yearning to help humanity which characterized Frances E. Willard as an educator, philanthropist, and friend.)

The statue is of Carrara marble, a little more than life size, and represents Miss Willard standing in an easy, graceful position. The right arm is slightly extended, the hand resting upon a reading desk; the left arm is at her side with a few pages of manuscript in the hand. The pose of the head is very lifelike as Miss Willard appeared when looking out upon an audience. The face is strong and spiritual.

The pedestal is of Vermont marble and bears the following inscription:

"Ah! it is women who have given the costliest hostages to fortune. Out into the battle of life they have sent their best beloved, with fearful odds against them. Oh, by the dangers they have dared; by the hours of patient watching over beds where helpless children lay; by the incense of ten thousand prayers wafted from their gentle lips to heaven, I charge you give them power to protect along life's treacherous highway those whom they have so loved."—Frances E. Willard.

Presented by the State of Illinois,

February XVII, MCMV.

In pursuance of a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on January 19, 1905, which I, as Representative of the district in which Frances E. Willard lived, had the honor to introduce, we are here assembled at this hour to receive and accept from the State of Illinois the statue of this noble woman, now erected in Statuary Hall.

Frances E. Willard was of New England ancestry. She was born in 1839, in the little village of Churchville, about 14 miles west of the city of Rochester, N. Y. When but 3 years of age her parents moved to Oberlin, Ohio, and five years afterwards they settled in Wisconsin, near the town of Janesville, where her father purchased a large farm on the banks of Rock River, and here she spent twelve years of her life. At the age of 17 she entered the female college of Milwaukee, where her aunt was professor of history, and remained there a year, and then pursued her studies further at the Woman's College of the Northwestern University, at Evanston. She stood at the head of her class and became editor of the college paper, and was a natural leader among her companions. Upon graduation she chose the profession of a teacher, and had she continued would have made one of the great teachers of the country, as she had a natural fitness for this work. For a time she taught at a female college in Pittsburgh, Pa., and at the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.

After a two years' trip abroad, she returned to Evanston, her home, and was elected dean of the Woman's College there, where she worked with great success for three years. Then she resigned her position and entered upon the greater work to which she was called.

She became President of a Chicago Woman's Christian Temperance Society, and soon after prepared her first lecture on "The New Chivalry," which produced such favorable comment that she was besieged with a large number of engagements to speak, and thus began her career as a public speaker.

Miss Anna A. Gordon, in her work on "The Beautiful Life of Frances E. Willard," states that—

The story of Miss Willard's early Chicago work reads like a romance. Into it she flung herself with the ardor of a St. Francis d'Assisi. She made the little great, the weak a power. She who had studied books now studied humanity.

In October of the same year she was the moving spirit in the organization of the Illinois Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and in November following she assisted in the organization of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Cleveland, Ohio, and became its secretary, so that within a few brief months after the choice of her career we find her an active force in the local, State, and national unions. In 1879 she was elected president of the national union, and was reelected year after year until she died.

In 1883, with Anna A. Gordon, her devoted friend and assistant, she visited every State and Territory in the Union, traveling 30,000 miles and organizing local unions everywhere. In the same year Miss Willard founded the World's Christian Temperance Union and became its president. She visited England in 1892, and was given a great reception in London, participated in by fifty philanthropic societies and some of the foremost men of Great Britain. She returned home and pursued her work with greater zeal and energy until she departed this life in the city of New York February 17, 1898—seven years ago to-day.



Time would fail me to describe the wonderful work accomplished by this woman. Edward Everett Hale, in his tribute to her, said:

Miss Willard has commanded and deserved the love and respect of millions of the women of this country. With unanimous loyalty, enthusiastic wherever they could express it, they chose her every year to be the president of their great temperance organization, whose work under her leadership has been extraordinary. Its history thus far has been the same thing as the biography of Frances Willard. That history is not simply the narrative of a noble life. It is an important illustration of wise administration. Her annual messages to her constituents are better worth reading than the messages of the President of the United States for the same time. They were messages to people she loved and who loved her, written with the enthusiasm of love letters by a woman singularly well educated, broad in her whole view of life, and in her very heart, and in every syllable which her heart prompted, brave and true.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of which Miss Willard was the controlling spirit, is the greatest organization of Christian women ever banded together for a great cause. It grew out of the great Woman's Temperance Crusade of 1873-74. It has sixty-four auxiliary unions, fifty-six are State, and six are Territorial, and the other two are the District of Columbia and Hawaii. It has been organized in every State and Territory of the nation and locally in 10,000 towns and cities. Its national motto is: "For God, for home, and native land." Its badge is the white ribbon, symbolical of purity and peace and the preservation of the home. Its principles are: "To educate the young; to form a better public sentiment; to reform, so far as possible, by religious, ethical, and scientific means, the drinking classes; to seek the transforming power of divine grace for ourselves and all for whom we work, that they and we may willfully transcend no law of pure and wholesome living; and finally we pledge ourselves to labor and to pray that all these principles, founded upon the Gospel and Christ, may be worked out into the customs of society and the laws of the land."

The World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union is composed of national unions which have been organized in over fifty nations, with a total membership of about half a million. These facts give a better idea than anything else of the great work which has been accomplished by Frances Willard, the founder of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Above all things Frances Willard was an organizer. She organized for women through women. She often said:

Alone we can do little, separated we are the units of weakness, but aggregated we become batteries of power. Agitate, educate, organize—these are the deathless watchwords of success.

Whittier has summed up her life work in these lines:

She knew the power of banded ill,  
But felt that love was stronger still,  
And organized, for doing good,  
The world's united womanhood.

[Applause.]

Frances Willard was an orator. She had the gift of eloquence to a remarkable degree. Both Beecher and Phillips have paid tribute to her power over audiences. Her voice was clear and penetrating and had in it that peculiar quality which held her audience entranced. She had a message and she told it with great simplicity, but with greater power. Gunsaulus and Hillis, two of the most eloquent preachers of our day, have testified to her powers of oratory. The former said:

If a great heart, fed by fiery streams from on high, glowing and molten with burning love for humanity, issuing forth its indignant denunciation of evil, pouring out incessant streams of argument against well-dressed error and fashionable wrong, kindling with lightning-like heat thousands of fellow-beings until they also flash to holy wrath which scathes the slayer and illumines the slain; if lifting millions of human beings from out the noise and dullness of unreason into the serene radiance of reason, so that they are willing to obey the highest ideals and to serve at any cost the noblest demands of humanity and God; if these be the characteristics or results of eloquence, then, without doubt, Frances Willard must be considered one of the most eloquent of the orators of our time.

Hillis has said:

Her greatest oratorical triumphs were in villages and cities, where some hall not holding more than a thousand people was crowded with appreciative listeners. At such times she stood forth one of the most gifted speakers of this generation, achieving efforts that were truly amazing. What ease and grace of bearing! What gentleness and strength! What pathos and sympathy! How exquisitely modulated her words! If her speech did not flow as a gulf stream; if it did not beat like an ocean upon a continent, she sent her sentences forth, an arrowy flight, and each tipped with divine fire.

Frances Willard was universally mourned as one of the greatest women of her time. Bishop Newman said of her:

For intelligence and eloquence she was the foremost woman of her generation. Such was the breadth of her catholicity that she recognized goodness wherever found. Her philanthropy touched suffering humanity in all lands. \* \* \* Let womanhood emulate her virtues, imitate her example, cherish her memory, till purity and temperance shall become coextensive with the business and abode of humanity.

Bishop Fallows said:

I have heard many women—women who have achieved greatness—but never have I heard one who was so finished and eloquent as the

dead leader of the great temperance movement among women. \* \* \* There was but one Miss Willard. \* \* \* She is worthy to rank with Jefferson, for she formulated a declaration of independence for her sex.

Bishop Vincent said:

Frances Willard was a dreamer and a doer. She saw visions and wrought them into orations and devices and achievements.

Doctor Barrows said:

Her grand life is a prophecy and harbinger of the good time which has been so long on the way. Miss Willard will be mourned in all the continents. I found her name as familiar and dear in Asia as in America.

John D. Long, speaking of her life, said:

It has been a life of devotion to humanity. Her services in the cause of temperance and good morals have been of inestimable value. Her example and influence will henceforth be a part of the forces molding the advancing civilization of our country and the world.

Dr. Josiah Strong said:

She was one of the great women of the world, and made all people her debtors.

Anthony Comstock said:

Earth has been enriched by her life and presence.

Canon Wilberforce paid tribute also to her personal influence, her platform gifts, her wonderful power of organization, and her single-heartedness.

Rev. F. W. Farrar, dean of Canterbury, said:

Miss Willard set a very noble example of self-denying labor on behalf of a great cause, and she showed how grand a work may be achieved by a single-hearted toiler inspired by the love of God and man.

Dr. George C. Lorimer has said:

If Miss Willard had been a man she would have rivaled Cobden and Bright in philanthropic statesmanship; if she had been a man she would have excelled Adam Smith in promoting the wealth of nations; if she had been a man she would have ranked with Wilberforce and Garrison in advancing the cause of emancipation; if she had been a man she would have shared the laurels of Carnot the elder as an organizer of armies and of Grant as their persistent and successful commander. But being a woman—well, posterity, I am sure, will assign her a unique niche in the temple of fame.

The State of Illinois presents this statue as a tribute to the life of Frances E. Willard, and in a larger and truer sense as a tribute to woman and the magnificent progress she has made under our free institutions.

The past century has been one of great progress in art, in literature, in science, in all things; not that it has produced the greatest poets in the world, nor the greatest authors, nor the greatest orators, but the century will be conspicuous in that education, enlightenment, and advancement have come to the many and not to the few. But the greatest progress has been that of woman.

Mrs. John Adams, a little over a hundred years ago, in speaking of the women of her time, said that "female education in the best families went no further than writing and arithmetic, and in some few and rare instances music and dancing." What a marvelous change has been wrought in the succeeding years in the education of woman.

Oberlin College, in Ohio, was the first institution to grant a diploma to women, in 1838. Since then the highest institutions, with few exceptions, have been thrown open to both sexes, and are granting degrees to women in theological, medical, and legal schools, and the world has marked the magnificent progress which woman has made.

A few years ago Susan B. Anthony in an article said that "fifty years ago woman in the United States was without a recognized individuality in any department of life," but now we find her in all occupations and in all professions dividing honors with men.

It might be asked, Why should the State of Illinois, which has produced so many illustrious men, offer the statue of a woman, the first to be placed in yonder hall among warriors and statesmen and pioneers and discoverers, who have wrought mightily for their country on the field of battle, in the halls of Congress, on the frontier, and in civil life? Why did not Illinois send here a statue of Lincoln, that divinely gifted man whom James Russell Lowell called "the first American," or why should she not place here in yonder hall the statue of the great Douglas, whose life was interwoven with that of Lincoln, the two mighty antagonists in the greatest debate of modern times?

Some might ask, Why not place there the statue of Ulysses S. Grant, the foremost general of the century, a man who wrought nobly for the salvation of his country and the preservation of the Union, and no sooner had the war clouds disappeared than he became the great advocate of peace, a perpetual peace between all sections of our common country in the eternal bonds of American brotherhood? [Applause.]

But these great men of Illinois whom I have named belonged to no State, but were given long since to the Union. No statue can ever add to their fame, and no monument can ever

tower as high as the magnificent character which they left to their country. Why confine them within the bounds of Statuary Hall? They have stood for many a year out under the American sky, the dome of the everlasting Union, and received the veneration of every American citizen for the mighty works which they wrought in the nation's life.

The Illinois legislature, without the slightest disrespect to her great sons, in its wisdom believed that the time had come when woman should be honored and when her statue should be placed in the American Pantheon, and who shall say that woman has no right there? [Applause.] What voice will be lifted to protest? Has all the wonderful development of our country ever since the time when that frail bark landed with its precious cargo of human freight on Plymouth Rock been accomplished by men? Has woman played no part in this tremendous national development? Has she exercised no influence on our national life?

Who does not recall the bravery of those noble women who endured the hardships and deprivations of life, for conscience sake, along with their fathers, their husbands, and their brothers in the first few years of the Plymouth colony? And all along down through the history of our country has not woman been the companion of man in the trials and tribulations, in peace and in war, doing her part as nobly as he, laying the foundations of the state, and building upon them a government of liberty, equality, and fraternity to all?

Time would fail me to enumerate many instances where woman has played a conspicuous part in our national history. Who does not recall Molly Pitcher, who fired the last gun at Fort Clinton, and afterwards received a lieutenant's commission from Washington?

Who does not recall Catherine Schuyler setting fire to the grain fields for fear that the British might reap the harvest? Who does not recall Narcissa Whitman, the first white woman to settle in the State of Washington, who, with her husband, Dr. Marcus Whitman, went as a missionary to the Indians and lost her life in the opening up of the far western country? Who does not recall how the early mothers wrought in the development of the mighty West everywhere? How they endured the hardships and braved the dangers of life in the paths of civilization and built the home and planted the sanctuary and worshipped their God out on the outposts of civilization, which later became the fortifications of freedom, of liberty, and enlightenment. [Applause.]

Nor, sir, can we forget the gentle ministering angels of the camps and hospitals during our wars, and particularly during our great civil war. On one side or on the other, for while there was a division of sentiment between two sections of our great country there was no sectionalism in the gentleness and the thoughtfulness of the American woman whether she lived in the North or in the South [applause], and many a northern soldier had his wounds bound up and went on his way through the attention and care of the noble women of the South. [Applause.]

American history indeed would not be complete without mentioning the name of Harriet Beecher Stowe, who through the mutterings of Uncle Tom awoke the conscience of the people to "man's injustice to man," and Julia Ward Howe, whose famous Battle Hymn of the Republic stirred the souls of men to victory, and Clara Barton [applause], who helped to bind the wounds which war had made.

In every field of human endeavor she has nobly done her part. Why, the mere mention of the names of Mary Lyon, Margaret Fuller, Harriet Martineau, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, Harriet Hosmer, Charlotte Cushman, Mary Livermore, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Helen Keller, Helen Gould, Bertha Palmer, Jane Addams, and others I might mention call to mind the influence and power of woman in the development of American civilization. [Applause.]

Nor should I forget that woman above all other women, whose life and all its energies are consecrated to the home; who quietly and patiently wends her way without any other thought than the development of the young life or lives around her, who in after years may rise to call her blessed; content to live, perchance, in a narrow sphere, educating her children, fitting them for higher stations in life than she ever hoped to occupy, giving them advantages she never could have, inspired by that one great thought of doing for those she loved—I refer to that noble woman whom each man calls "mother." [Applause.]

How often do we hear men who have achieved the greatest success in human life with one accord turn and say that their success is due to her. Perhaps no instance is so conspicuous in recent years as that of our martyred McKinley. What poet can say proper tribute, what author can give full praise, or what orator can ever describe the height and depth of a

mother's love? She, after all, has been the mighty controlling influence in our national life. [Applause.]

Frances E. Willard herself once said: "If I were asked what was the true mission of the ideal woman, I would say, 'It is to make the whole world motherlike.'"

Illinois, therefore, presents this statue, not only as a tribute to her whom it represents—one of the foremost women of America—but as a tribute to woman and her mighty influence upon our national life; to woman in the home; to woman in all the occupations and professions of life; to woman in all her charity and philanthropy, wherever she is toiling for the good of humanity; to woman everywhere, who has ever stood "for God, for home, for native land." [Great applause.]

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of the State of Illinois passed an act which was approved by Governor John R. Tanner February 28, 1899, entitled "An act to select a commission to expend not to exceed \$9,000 to purchase a heroic bronze or marble statue of the late Frances E. Willard, and to provide a pedestal, to be appropriately inscribed and ornamented, and also to defray the expenses of transportation of same to Washington, D. C., when completed, and erecting it in the national Statuary Hall" in this city. The preamble of that act reads as follows:

Whereas Congress has invited each State of the Union to furnish statues in marble or bronze of two of its deceased citizens, illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service, and deemed worthy of national commemoration, and to have the same placed in the National Statuary Hall in the Capitol at Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the State of Illinois has furnished but one of its statues, and before the close of the century should complete the number allotted to it; and

Whereas Illinois has been noted for its illustrious warriors, jurists, and statesmen—Grant, Shields, Logan, Palmer, McClelland, Davis, Trumbull, Brees, Schofield, McAllister, Lincoln, Douglas, Yates, Lovejoy, and countless others, like McDougal and Baker—who won fame in other States; and

Whereas the fame of none of these was more heroically won or more richly deserved than that of one of our deceased citizens, illustrious for historic renown and distinguished for civic service in Europe and America in a new, unexplored field of Christian endeavor, the effect of whose efforts and achievements and the influence of whose spotless life and sublime example has been so marked that the world has wondered and admired the author, the organizer, and advocate of purity and temperance, Illinois's most illustrious deceased citizen, Frances E. Willard, the uncrowned queen of purity and temperance, whose ashes repose in peace on the shores of Lake Michigan at Evanston, Ill. Her life, like that of her Redeemer, was devoted to the spiritual welfare of mankind, and the world at large has been materially benefited by her prayers and sacrifices. Radiant with a halo of all the virtues, her face shone with the light of intelligence. Her marvelous abilities energized all around and about her, while her gentleness, tact, and self-sacrificing spirit calmed every storm that arose in the councils which were graced and blessed by her presence. Her grand life is a "beacon light" to the good and the true of all sexes, races, and creeds in the civilized world, and her wonderful achievements are lights and landmarks on the cliffs of fame, which will for all time illumine the paths of millions of women wherever civilization has a footing, which is where woman is duly appreciated; and

Whereas the priceless heritage of such a life belongs of right to Illinois; and

Whereas she glories in it and deems it "worthy of national commemoration;" Therefore,

To immortalize it and show to all nations how exalted a sphere woman occupies in this great State, the following law is placed upon our statute books.

The commissioners appointed by Governor Tanner were: Miss Anna A. Gordon, Evanston; Mrs. Susanna M. D. Frye, Evanston; W. R. Jewell, Danville; Mary E. Metzger, Moline; J. J. Mitchell, Chicago.

The commissioners appropriately awarded the fashioning of this statue to an American woman, Helen Farnsworth Mears.

By this act of the State of Illinois through its legislature, the first statue of a woman is to stand in Statuary Hall among other famous Americans who have done sufficiently great work to justify some State of the Union in thus honoring their memory.

Of the population of the United States, there are 37,178,127 females, and 38,816,448 males. In the moral and religious work of the world woman is conceded by all to have taken a part and exerted an influence fully commensurate with her proportionate numbers. Yes, I believe her to have been the larger factor in the moral and religious advance of mankind.

In the last half century her intellectual life has rapidly widened with the growth of education and intelligence. In those nations at the present time, where is now found the largest measure of political liberty, the highest standard of living, and the greatest individual prosperity and happiness are to be found for woman the greatest civil rights, the largest freedom of action, the widest field of opportunities.

In nearly every State of the Union the restraints of the common law have been removed by legislative action and woman has been given every legal right excepting that of suffrage with well-nigh a universal acquiescence.

In a few States the unrestricted right of suffrage has been



accorded her, and in many others the right to vote for school officers has been extended to her.

In no other nation of the world has the political rights of women been broadened as rapidly as they have in this country. Her prominence in the educational work of the United States meets with no denial. Her impress upon the life of the nation has become more and more apparent, and always for good. She has contributed her full share in the achievements of our nation. She has not only molded the character and trained the intellect of our citizenship, but has been a worthy and equal companion with her sons and husband in after life in their private enterprises and their public duties.

If the most distinguished of those who are immortalized in marble in yonder hall could speak their belief as to the greatest factor in their secured fame, the answer would undoubtedly be, "My mother."

Therefore it seems to me that the decision of my State was a most appropriate and wise one in selecting in this day and age from her illustrious sons and daughters the best known and most universally loved woman in the United States, Frances E. Willard, as the one to be commemorated in marble and stand in the national Capitol, as an evidence of our appreciation of a singularly beautiful and useful life.

Descended from Puritan stock, with an ancestry especially notable in religious and educational work; born in New York, taken as a child to Ohio, and moving from thence later in the typical prairie schooner to her forest home in Wisconsin, where she spent her girlhood, and finally commencing her young womanhood at Evanston, Ill., and retaining her home there, to be brought back at the time of her death to be buried, she was essentially an American.

Born on September 28, 1830, at Churchville, N. Y., and passing away February 20, 1898, at New York City, she witnessed the development of American civilization from a primitive condition through its development of almost sixty years. The measure of a human life is its motive rather than its accomplishments. Back of the great achievements for the nation accomplished through the guidance of Abraham Lincoln are the motives which moved him, the principles which controlled him.

To-day we have enjoyed the blessings which are the fruition of his work so long that we hardly stop to appreciate them; but the American people still hunger for every stray incident concerning his personal life which in any way aids in the further interpretation of the character of this man, who in the midst of failure would have remained the lover of humanity. [Applause.]

As with Lincoln, the closer one studies the incidents of the life of Frances E. Willard the fuller the details of her daily life and its purposes are made known, the more evident it becomes that she was first and foremost of all a lover of humanity and that the one purpose of her life was to devote it to the best advantage for the uplifting of her kind.

She regarded her life as a "charge to keep," and it is said that she was guided by the spirit of the rocking-chair lullaby sung to her by her father:

To serve the present age,  
My calling to fulfill,  
Oh, may it all my power engage  
To do my Master's will.

From a lisping child she was nurtured under religious influences and imbued with the thoughts that her life should be devoted to high and noble purposes, and hence after her education had been completed at Northwestern University and she had commenced her life work's further preparation as dean of the woman's college at Evanston her constant aim was to impress upon her students the importance of a purposeful life.

The oft-repeated question to her girl students was, "What do you intend to do in life?" The great object to her in education was the development of character. "What shall we do with our lives?" was the question ringing through her life as a teacher and reformer. She was proud of her sex. She strove to elevate it. She endeavored to broaden its opportunities, to enlarge its usefulness, to increase its influence, to uplift its purposes. If her life was viewed from the standpoint of her influence upon the women of the United States, without regard to her work elsewhere or upon men, she still would be the greatest figure of our country in woman's work and woman's betterment. [Applause.]

Her educational work gave a distinct impetus to the higher education of women and accident played an important part in taking her from this field into the larger national work for purity and temperance. She displayed wonderful powers of organization and executive ability as head of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union and as president of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the latter of which she founded. Other women have become distinguished

and national figures, but no one of her kind ever became so universally known and loved throughout the entire land in the humblest homes. She reached down into the lives of the millions and made her influence felt, and broadened and sweetened lives and changed their purpose for the better to the extent, perhaps, that no man or other woman of America has ever done. [Applause.]

She broadened her culture and enlarged her knowledge of life by study abroad in Europe and in the East, but all of the powers of this richly endowed woman were devoted to the single purpose of her life.

The motto of her order, "For God, and home, and native land," was manifest in her every effort. She rightly conceived that the homes of America should be the safeguards of the nation, and hence her philanthropic work was devoted to the elevation of the home life. Her face is familiar to almost every child as well as those of maturer years from ocean to ocean. And what is more important the principles for what that face stood are quite as familiar. She addressed large audiences in every city of 10,000 people and upward in the United States and in many of smaller population. She met the test of the orator, for she won converts and changed lives through the medium of her speeches.

As an orator she ever remained the woman, and throughout her work her methods were distinctly womanly. Her activity was simply wonderful, and the energy which she was able to sustain with her delicate body was a constant surprise to her friends. She practically had no leisure. And the influence of the female organizations which were under her chief control have certainly left a deep and permanent impress upon American life and that of the world. Did she complete the vast work in which she was engaged? Did she consummate the complete reformation of the world? Ah, no. It is manifest from all history that the moral evolution of mankind is most exceedingly slow. Is to succeed the test of greatness? From the illustrious men whose figures and memories are perpetuated in yonder hall select one whose great work was accomplished to its full extent! Not one. The future is full of problems for the centuries. It is for each man and woman to do his little part. Be it said, however, that the moral tone of the people of the United States is higher, the field of woman enlarged and fuller of hope, and the future of the United States is brighter for the life of this woman, honored by the State and nation because her work was good and immortal, because Frances E. Willard yet speaks. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure and congratulate my fellow-citizens of this Republic upon the fact that we place woman upon a higher standard than is done in any other civilized nation in the world. [Applause.] The dissemination of education in the last twenty years has brought about new ideals concerning the proper elements which make up the successful mother, which enables her to perform all of the duties connected with the fashioning of human souls, with the building of human character, with the forecasting of the future of human lives. It is no longer believed in the United States that a woman is sufficiently informed and equipped if she is able to do the physical duties connected with the household. We now understand that she has the most delicate task of all other occupations. She has the most important task for the future of the Republic, because this Republic rests for its safety upon the character of its citizenship. The child is the father of the man, and it is the women of America who give direction to the trend of mature life; it is the women who first implant the character of aspirations which afterwards manifest themselves in the active manhood of the United States. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the State of Illinois is going forward in taking this new step, when she presumes that the women of the United States, with the important duties which they have to perform to society as well as to their families, have a right to a part in this Hall, commemorated to the forms of those who have done great work in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, by an act of Congress approved July 2, 1864, the President was authorized "to invite each and all the States to provide and furnish statues in marble or bronze, not exceeding two in number for each State, of deceased persons who have been citizens thereof and illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military services." The "old Hall of the House of Representatives" was set apart "as a National Statuary Hall" for the purpose indicated. Thus was established the Valhalla of the Republic. Nineteen States only have thus far placed their candidates for statuary fame therein. Five of these—Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, and Wisconsin—have but one representative each. The reason for the selection of some of these candidates does not appear to be conspicuously obvious.

The services and historic renown of such men as Roger Sherman, Jonathan Trumbull, O. P. Morton, John J. Ingalls, Samuel Adams, Charles Carroll, William King, Robert Fulton, Robert R. Livingston, Lewis Cass, Thomas H. Benton, Daniel Webster, James A. Garfield, Nathanael Greene, Roger Williams, Samuel Houston, and Jacob Collamer are so well known as to fully justify them in filling a niche in this Hall of Fame.

Some of them contributed in a large degree to the building of the Republic. It is a singular and interesting fact that while the list of our Presidents contains many of the most distinguished men of our history, only one, James A. Garfield, one of the most intellectual of them all, has found a place here. While "military services" is an eligible feature, besides that chivalric old warrior of San Jacinto, Samuel Houston, none of them can be said to have achieved any distinction in the trade of war except the gallant soldier Gen. James Shields, who until to-day has been the sole representative from the State of Illinois. He has the unique distinction of having represented three States in the Senate of the United States. Except as they are so made by this selection, not many of them are or will be "illustrious for their historic renown." It is possible that in many instances the most appropriate selections may not have been made, and that but for these statues some of them would never have emerged from kindly oblivion.

That Illinois has been for some time represented only in part is from no lack of worthy material. She has long had eminent men worthy of this great honor. Some of the most distinguished men of our history, so great and distinguished that they stand out like mountain peaks almost alone in the sky line of historic perspective, belong to Illinois.

No soldier deserves more or will live longer in the hearts of his countrymen for great services rendered, from Washington until now, than the unassuming but indomitable Grant. His fame is Illinois's.

The student of our political history will never read of a more brilliant figure than the little giant of the West, the great war Democrat, the prince of debaters, the patriot, Stephen A. Douglas. [Applause.] In Illinois he lived and died.

The greatest figure in American history—yes, one of the greatest figures in the history of the world—the immortal, celestial, martyred Lincoln, belongs alike to Illinois. She has many other illustrious sons. With all this wealth of material Illinois to-day places in this great Pantheon the statue of a beautiful Christian woman, who has a deserved and world-wide renown for "distinguished civic" services.

By her own efforts she had "achieved greatness." Without this legislative recognition her name and fame were secure. It was written on the fleshly tablets of millions of human hearts beyond all power of effacement. The beautiful marble, the enduring bronze, or the eternal granite were not necessary to perpetuate it. It was as firmly fixed "as though graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever."

This is the first time that our Valhalla has been graced, adorned, and honored by the statue of a woman. Frances Elizabeth Willard can fittingly and appropriately represent her sex in this distinguished and honorable company. Illinois honors herself by giving to womankind this noble recognition. It is a most gratifying reflection that if the mighty and sainted shade of the departed Lincoln could have been consulted it would have no doubt concurred with hearty enthusiasm in this selection. She was the especial representative of a great cause in whose principles he religiously believed and whose tenets he faithfully practiced. Abraham Lincoln was a total abstainer. The sincerity of his habits and practice in this regard were subjected to the highest test when the committee to notify him of his nomination as a candidate of the Republican party for the Presidency visited him at his modest home in Springfield.

After having received the momentous message, in the presence of that distinguished and notable gathering he said:

Gentlemen, we must pledge our mutual health in the most healthy beverage which God has given to man. It is the only beverage I have ever used or allowed in my family, and I can not conscientiously depart from it now on this occasion. It is pure Adam's ale.

In a private and confidential letter written June 11, 1860, in referring to this incident, he wrote:

Having kept house sixteen years and having never held the "cup" to the lips of my friends then, my judgment was that I should not, in my new position, change my habits in this respect.

How the moral courage and absolute sincerity of the man is exemplified by this incident. While he did not make his views offensively conspicuous, he did not hesitate when occasion called to avow them.

Hon. Lawrence Weldon, of Washington, D. C., a distinguished and able judge of the Court of Claims, traveled from his home to Bloomington, Ill., on September 12, 1854, for the purpose of

hearing Judge Douglas discuss the political issues of the day. At that time he had never met Mr. Lincoln, who was in town attending court. Mr. Weldon was present in Douglas's room at the hotel when Douglas declined an invitation to divide the time with Mr. Lincoln.

On a sideboard were liquors of various kinds. Lincoln came in and Douglas introduced him to Mr. Weldon. Social drinking was then a well-nigh universal custom, and in a few minutes Douglas said: "Mr. Lincoln, won't you have something to drink?" To this Mr. Lincoln replied: "No, Judge, I think not." "What," said Douglas, "do you belong to the temperance society?" "No," rejoined Mr. Lincoln, "I don't belong to any temperance society, but I am temperate in this, to wit, I don't drink anything." This incident I have from the Judge's lips.

Nor did he hesitate to preach in accordance with his practice.

On Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1842, in his own home city, he delivered one of the most remarkable temperance addresses extant. Referring to the drink habit, he said:

Let us make it as unfashionable to withhold our names from the temperance pledge as for husbands to wear their wives' bonnets to church, and instances will be just as rare in the one case as in the other.

Speaking of the dignity and vital importance of the temperance reform, he said:

If the relative grandeur of revolutions shall be estimated by the great amount of human misery they alleviate and the small amount they inflict, then indeed will this be the grandest the world shall have ever seen. Of our political revolution of "76" we all are justly proud. It has given us a degree of political freedom far exceeding that of any other of the nations on the earth. In it the Old World has found a solution of that long-mooted problem as to the capability of man to govern himself.

In it was the germ which has vegetated and still is to grow and expand into the universal liberty of mankind. But with all these glorious results past, present, and to come it had its evils too. It breathed forth famine, swam in blood, and rode on fire, and long, long after the orphan's cry and widow's wail continued to break the sad silence that ensued. These were the price, the inevitable price, paid for the blessings it brought.

Turn now to the temperance revolution. In it we shall find a stronger bondage broken, a viler slavery unmanumitted, a greater tyrant deposed. In it more of want supplied, more disease healed, more sorrow assuaged. By it no orphans starving, no widows weeping. By it none wounded in feeling, none injured in interest.

And what a noble ally is this to the cause of political freedom. With such an aid its march can not fail to be on and on until every son on earth shall drink in rich fruition the sorrow-quenching draught of perfect liberty. Happy day, when all appetite is controlled, all passions subdued, all manners subjected, mind—all-conquering mind—shall live and move, the monarch of the world. Glorious consummation. "Hail, fall of Fury! Reign of Reason, hail!" This rings with no uncertain sound.

The momentous character of this great question never was and probably never will be stated more forcibly, vigorously, effectively, and truthfully. He was a most vigorous and effective advocate of that logical corollary of total abstinence for the individual, prohibition for the State. He spent weeks in Illinois campaigning for the adoption of the Maine law in that State. The following excerpts were the keynotes of his speeches:

This legalized liquor traffic, as carried on in the saloons and grog shops, is the great tragedy of civilization. The saloon has proved itself to be the greatest foe, the most blighting curse that has ever found a home in our modern civilization, and this is the reason why I am a political Prohibitionist. Prohibition brings the desired result. It suppresses the saloon by law. It stamps and brands the saloonkeeper as a criminal in the sight of God and man.

By licensing the saloon we feed with one hand the fires of appetite we are striving to quench with the other. While this state of things continues let us know that this war is all our own—both sides of it—until this guilty connivance of our own actions shall be withdrawn. I am a Prohibitionist because prohibition destroys destruction.

In 1863 he declared that—

The reasonable man of the world has long since agreed that intemperance is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of all evils among mankind.

That his wide and varied experience never changed his earlier views is clear from the statement made by him to Mr. Mervin on the very morning of his assassination:

After reconstruction, the next great work before us is the prohibition of the liquor traffic in all of the States and Territories.

Inspired by this high and lofty purpose he entered the presence of his Maker.

Abraham Lincoln was neither a crank, a fanatic, a hare-brained enthusiast, nor a hypocrite. None of us need be ashamed to follow where he nobly led. [Applause.] His footsteps have made it holy ground. If the shades of the departed revisit the haunts of men, we may feel assured that he would behold with the greatest of satisfaction the recognition of the cause in which he believed with his whole heart by the erection of this memorial to the memory of this brilliant and devoted woman.



This statue in our Valhalla is a fit and merited recognition of all that is highest, noblest, and best in womanhood.

In the evolution and development of the race from barbarism to Christian civilization woman has been gradually emancipated from the subordinate and servile position to which the aboriginal savage, at a period dominated by physical force and unfeeling, ignorant brutality, had arbitrarily relegated her. While her emancipation is not yet complete, it has been tardily keeping pace with our developing civilization and is in no small degree the indication of that development. She is now no longer

Something better than his dog,  
A little dearer than his horse.

She is not only the equal, but, in many respects, immeasurably the superior of the lords of creation. Still, in some respects before the law, with its many relics and survivals of the dark ages, she still wears the badge of inferiority. These Miss Willard struggled manfully to remove. Notwithstanding the arbitrary disadvantages under which she has labored, women have in all ages given us shining examples of greatness and genius that need not shrink from comparison with the sterner sex.

Sappho, it is conceded, has never been surpassed in sweetness and grace by any lyric poet, ancient or modern. Plato called her the "tenth muse" and Aristotle ranked her with Homer. Socrates sat at the feet of Aspasia and learned philosophy. She taught Pericles statesmanship, and is said to have written some of his most famous orations. The modest, pure, guileless girl of 17—Joan of Arc—took the command of an army and led it to victory with a success that makes the fame and supernatural genius of the great Napoleon pale their "ineffectual fires." It has been well said "she is easily and by far the most extraordinary person the human race has ever produced."

The enlightened enterprise and lofty public spirit of Isabella of Spain made it possible for Columbus to discover the New World, which was destined to become the home of the mightiest republic the world ever saw.

Saint Theresa was canonized by the Pope for the great reforms she wrought in Catholic orders, and the value of her religious writings.

Queen Elizabeth, although crafty and cruel, was learned and able, and the Elizabethan period is one of the most splendid in English history.

Enlightened beyond her time, the Empress Marie Theresa abolished torture and the inquisition, and was one of the greatest of the Austrian rulers.

Catherine of Russia was the patron of learning, and ruled with a truly masculine vigor.

Profound in moral and political philosophy, unequalled in dialectic discussion, Madame De Stael had the proud distinction of compelling the haughty and intolerant Napoleon to banish her twice through fear of her pen that was "mightier than the sword."

Abigail Adams was one of the incomparable mothers of the Revolution, whose letters to her son are uplifting and ennobling, and still the highest guide to right living.

Queen Louise of Prussia, the noble and good, was the mother of kingly kings. Elizabeth Barrett Browning was easily among the first of modern poets. George Eliot was the Shakespeare of women, a novelist of the highest order. The world-renowned philanthropist, the John Howard of her sex, was found in Florence Nightingale. Rachel, the magnificent, reached the highest altitude of dramatic expression. In Jenny Lind the human voice in song found its most popular and attractive expression. In the professor's study in beautiful Brunswick, within the shade of Bowdoin's classic walls, the phillipic was written that was the most powerful factor in precipitating the fratricidal struggle that was not to end until human slavery was no more.

After Harriet Beecher Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin and the Dred Scott decision no human power could avert the crisis. And when the struggle came this stanza—

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,  
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;  
As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,  
While God is marching on—

of Julia Ward Howe inspired the courage, sustained the valor, renewed the patriotic fervor, and steelled the arm of the battling hosts of freemen.

To such as these we can well bow down and worship. They are the splendid creations of a great race.

In this brilliant galaxy of great women Frances Elizabeth Willard has placed her name. Her deeds have written it there. Educated, cultured, refined. She was a journalist, an author, and a professor, but she abandoned them all that she might devote her life to the advancement and promotion of the cause that was near and dear to her. The sacred cause that has the soul-inspiring watchword "For God and home and native land."

Whittier beautifully and appropriately says, in lines addressed to her:

She knew the power of banded ill,  
But felt that love was stronger still,  
And organized for doing good  
The world's united womanhood.

She deliberately relinquished the brilliant position of dean of the first woman's college connected with a university in America to go out penniless, alone, and unheralded, because her spirit had caught the rhythm of the women's footsteps as they bridged the distance between the home and the saloon in the pentecostal days of the temperance crusade. She relinquished that which women hold dearest and most sacred, the shelter of home.

It was that other women might, under their own "vine and fig tree," enjoy the blessings of a pure and virtuous home that she sacrificed and toiled and endured. She found the Woman's Christian Temperance Union a national organization. She made it international. Its labors were confined to one country; she made its activities world wide. Its motto of "For God and home and native land," with divinely inspired evangel hope and faith, she transformed to "For God and home and every land."

In 1883 she became the president of this organization, based upon "personal purity of life, including total abstinence from all narcotic poisons, the protection of the home by outlawing the traffic in intoxicating liquors, opium, tobacco, and the suppression by law of gambling and Sunday desecration; the enfranchisement of the women of all nations; and the establishment of courts of national and international arbitration which shall banish war from the world."

Before her untimely death she had the infinite satisfaction of knowing that it was firmly planted in fifty different countries, where, in the common language of the heart, though in many different tongues, it "ministered to all good and true women who are willing to clasp hands in one common effort to protect their homes and loved ones from the ravages of drink," by "an organization without a pattern save that seen in heavenly vision upon the mount of faith, and without a peer among the sisterhoods that have grouped themselves around the cross of Christ." Millions were brought within the reach of its elevating, humanizing, Christianizing influences. These gentle persuasive ministrations proceeded in the faith that "the banner and the sword were never yet the symbol of man's grandest victories," and that the time was at hand "to listen to the voice of that inspired philosophy which through all ages has been gently saying, 'the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong.'"

While she had extraordinary executive and administrative ability, she could not have accomplished her great work had she not been divinely blessed with qualities and graces of the mind, heart, and person that are seldom found combined.

Attractive, engaging, and beautiful in person, with a musical voice of marvelous sweetness and purity, intellectual, logical, persuasive, and eloquent, she had a platform presence and manner that made her easily one of the most eloquent and effective of orators.

If true eloquence is to be measured by the effect produced upon the hearers, she had few equals and no superiors.

No repetition of her language can reproduce the charm that clothed it as it fell from her lips. She brought all the wealth of culture and learning to her work. That she realized the importance of the highest ideals in literature and keenly appreciated the infinite harm of covering vice with an attractive garb and minimizing its wickedness and infamy, was vividly portrayed by her address on the presentation of the portrait of Mrs. Hayes. She then said:

What shall be said of the wizard pen of the romancer, with its boundless sweep through time and space? Alas, with what borrowed livery of the imagination has it not disguised the dangers of the moderate drinker and bedecked the brutal pleasures of the debauchee. Heroes have been men mighty to drink wine, and heroines have found their prototype in Hebe, cupbearer to the gods. From the sensuous pages of the Greek romancers, through medieval tale and legend, the reeling pages of Fielding, the chivalric pageantry of Scott, the splendid society drama of Thackeray, and the matchless character panoramas of Dickens, down to our own society novels; in all the witching volumes over which the beaming eyes of youth have lingered the high lights of convivial enjoyment have been brought out in most vivid word painting, and its black shadows as studiously concealed. Now be it remembered that the poet, the artist, and the novelist—mighty interpreters of nature and the soul—will always maintain their empire over the human heart so long as it is a willing captive to the love of beauty, and the beauty of love. So that until we win an assured place for the temperance reform in these supremely influential realms of thought and expression our success can not be considered as permanent. Until genius, with her starry eyes, shall be gently persuaded to lay her choicest trophies at the feet of temperance there will remain for us much territory to be possessed.

The most striking and unique incident of her work was the celebrated Polyglot Petition for Home Protection presented "to the governments of the world." It was signed throughout the civilized world, and in fifty different languages. The signatures mounted upon canvas, four columns abreast, made more



than a mile of canvas and nearly five miles of solid signatures, 771,200 in all. It represented by societies and associations over 7,500,000 persons. It was ten years in circulation. In an eloquent and impressive speech, Miss Willard presented it to President Cleveland February 19, 1895. The English branch was headed by Lady Henry Somerset, the magnificent English woman who is leading in temperance reform in England. On the American petition, like Abou Ben Adhem, and for the same reason, Neal Dow's name "led all the rest."

More than fifty years ago General Dow, at the request of the broken-hearted wife of a drunken husband, called upon a saloon keeper and urged him not to sell to the unfortunate man. He was ordered out of the saloon with the remark, "There's my license on the wall. This man is one of my best customers. I'll not offend him." "Do you mean that you will go right on selling whisky to him?" said Dow. "I shall sell to him just as long as he can pay for his drinks," replied the saloon keeper. As General Dow left the saloon he said, "The people of the State of Maine will see how long you will go on selling." In 1851 came the Maine law. With the exception of two years—1856-1858—it has been steadfastly adhered to ever since, though not as continuously and effectively enforced as it ought to be. It has been estimated from actual sales taken from old account books that prior to 1851 the people of Raymond, then a small town of 1,149 souls, with a valuation of about \$150,000, consumed more liquor in every period of eighteen years than the entire valuation of the town. To-day no liquor tax is paid in the town, and while its population has decreased to 823, its valuation has increased to \$213,576. The soil and climate of Maine are not such as make the development and accumulation of wealth an easy task. The natural facilities that contribute to that end are much inferior to those found in the Middle States, the South, and the great West.

Nature has done little for her beyond furnishing the opportunity for the development of an energetic, enterprising, vigorous, hardy, intelligent, and sturdy people. They have sent thousands upon thousands of their hard-earned savings during the last two decades into the far West, attracted by the expectation of a profitable return thereon. Very few of these thousands ever have returned, or ever will return, thus diminishing her savings and impairing her wealth.

There is nothing in her policy or law that differentiates her from her sister States except the prohibitory law. The only reliable indicator of the thrift and prosperity of a people is its savings. In this respect the people of Maine, fostered by legislation that preserves their earnings, challenges all comparison.

In 1850 she had no savings banks; in 1900 she had deposited \$66,132,677 in her savings banks. While she ranks only thirteenth in population among the States of the Union, there are only six that outrank her in the amount of savings deposits, and only seven which have a larger number of depositors.

Illinois, with about seven times the population of Maine, has \$7,000,000 less savings deposit. Ohio, with nearly six times the population of Maine, has \$22,000,000 less deposits. Pennsylvania, with nine times the population of Maine, has only \$40,000,000 more deposits. In other words, Maine has in her savings banks \$95.22 for every inhabitant. Illinois has only \$13.43; Ohio, \$10.71; and Pennsylvania, \$16.12. While Maine's population has increased since 1850 only 20 per cent, her valuation per capita has increased 252 per cent. A single concrete, unimpeachable, significant fact like this, bearing living witness to the efficacy of her settled policy, is of more value than reams of newspaper columns full of ill-considered and unfounded assertions that the law has been a practical failure. [Applause.] It is entirely true, as eloquently and incisively declared by Governor Cobb, of Maine, in his recent noble message, that this law "lies very close to the heart and conscience of thousands of the men and women" of Maine.

Miss Willard believed in the wisdom and efficacy of this legislation. Sincere and zealous enthusiast as she was, she was essentially and always broad minded, catholic, and tolerant in her views. She knew that intelligent discussion and free and open agitation would in the end disclose and firmly establish the truth. In her last important public utterance she laid down Cobden's rule as her guide: "Never assume that the motives of the man who is opposed to you in policy or argument are one whit less pure and disinterested than your own." Commenting, she said:

But, alas, it is our custom to consider that wisdom will die with us, and that truthfulness first had its being when we were born. While the facts are, speaking broadly, that being subject to a certain pressure of education certain great masses of men look upon them in another way, and nothing short of that argumentation which politics furnishes will enable both groups to reach at last an equilibrium of thought by leavening the entire lump with two different kinds of education, so that one view shall modify the other. How true is it that the greatest of all these is charity.

The home is the basic unit of our Christian civilization. It is the foundation stone upon which our free institutions rest. Upon its integrity, purity, and character the character and quality of our civilization depend. It is a holy shrine. Whatever profanes it pollutes the sacred temple of liberty itself. Whoever defends and ennobles it insures to our children and our children's children the blessings of freedom and the enduring of a "government of the people, for the people, and by the people." A civilization based upon a lecherous and debauched home is rotten at the core.

Statesmen, warriors, and patriots may strive and build and achieve, but all their striving, building, and achieving is in vain, even "as sounding brass and the tinkling cymbal," if it disregards the eternal moral verities and does not conserve the true happiness and the highest welfare of mankind. This divinely gifted woman bent every energy, shaped every purpose, and devoted every aspiration of a godly life to the consummation of this happiness and welfare. It is meet that her work should be thus recognized.

This statue stands, and always will stand, as the highest and truest embodiment of all that is noblest, best, and divinest in the womanhood of America and the enduring memorial of "whatsoever things are of good report" in our Christian civilization. [Great applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, forty-one years ago, when the two great sections of our country still contended in awful battle, Congress passed an act making out of the old hall of the House of Representatives a national gallery, to which each State was invited to contribute the statues of two of her most famous citizens. Since then the States have been responding until now nineteen of them are represented here.

In this hall of fame statues of warriors and of statesmen stand side by side.

Men acquire fame upon the battlefield, amid the pomp and glory of war. This opportunity is denied to women. Men acquire fame as diplomats and statesmen, but this opportunity also is closed to women; and so we have in Statuary Hall figures of heroic size presented by the States; nearly all of them are the portraits in stone and marble and bronze of men who have had access to these great fields of human effort and human ambition; for them the door of opportunity stood always open.

Until to-day no State has contributed the statue of a woman. No one imagined forty-one years ago, when this act was passed, that the heroic figure of a woman would ever stand beneath that Dome. But the world is growing in more ways than one; and the world is ready now to believe that a courageous womanly woman makes as heroic a figure as a brave manly man. [Applause.]

When the act was passed which established this hall of fame men were winning the right to a place here upon the field of battle at the head of crushing squadrons of cavalry, or directing the movement of long lines of infantry, amid the roar of cannon and all the din of war. Their statues—some of them—are already here, and there are more to come. But the real battle which made this a nation, one and indivisible, was fought and won after the surrender at Appomattox; after the men of the blue army had returned to their northern homes; after the men of the gray army had sadly gone back to ruined plantations throughout the pleasant Southland. The real victory was won long after the green grass was growing and the flowers were blooming upon the graves of the men who fell in this, the greatest civil war the world ever saw. It was a victory won in a battle waged by men and women of the South, standing shoulder to shoulder with men and women of the North—a peaceful struggle to quench the fires of sectional hate and antagonism.

It was at this time that there came out of the North a new leader—not a leader of armed men, but a leader of unarmed women—a woman of supreme capacity mental and moral and physical. Illinois to-day presents her statue, exquisitely carved out of the whitest of Carara marble, to the nation as her contribution to this great hall of fame. [Applause.]

In the years which followed the war one of the forces most potent to sweep away the mists and let in the sunlight upon North and South alike was the army of women, led by Frances E. Willard, marching through the North and the South following the white banners upon which she had inscribed the motto, "For God and Home and Native Land." In the dark days which followed the war she furnished the common ground upon which all could stand, whether they lived under bright skies where the magnolia blooms or under grayer skies in the colder North.

She led the fight for the home, for personal purity, for better habits of living, for the rights of children, for the uplifting of women. Upon these great subjects she delivered addresses in



almost all the towns and cities of the country containing a population of 5,000 and upward. On one of her campaigns she traveled 30,000 miles, speaking almost every day in crowded halls and churches.

With chains of gold stretching across the gulf which divided the sections she bound together the homes of the North and the homes of the South until the dividing chasm disappeared and a mighty nation moves forward under one banner with resistless force to the tremendous destiny prepared for it by the omnipotent God. If peace hath its victories, it is peculiarly appropriate that Miss Willard's statue should stand here under this dome. In the State which produced a Lincoln, a Douglas, and a Logan we consider her one of our greatest citizens. [Applause.]

The past century has been called the woman's century. During the latter half of the century a woman sat on the throne in England, and under her gentle and wise influence literature and the arts flourished and the commerce of the English nation whitened every sea. During the same period of time the woman we honor here to-day, with gentle strength, was fighting for the success of all the higher moral forces. She made her opportunities—none of them were inherited. She did not come into a throne by divine right; but her purity of purpose, her loyalty at all times, her tenderness, her breadth of human sympathy, her resistless energy, won for her the title of "the uncrowned queen," and in the hearts of five million true women of the land she reigned supreme.

Three hundred years ago, on the banks of a beautiful river in far away India, at fabulous cost, a king erected a tomb in memory of a woman. With towering minarets of whitest marble it stands to-day the most splendid building ever erected by man. The women of America have erected in memory of Frances E. Willard a monument not made of marble, which crumbles with the passing centuries, but made of that enduring material which withstands the ravages of time—a monument of human love and human admiration and human sympathy. [Applause.]

She was a true child of the prairie. During the fifty years of her active career she lived in the State of Illinois, and from her modest, quiet cottage in the village of Evanston, where only the murmurs of the great lake broke the stillness, she issued forth, a modern Joan of Arc, to fight the nation's enemies—aglow with purpose—wearing the armor of truth and womanly purity. She has won a place in the temple of the truly great. Frances E. Willard is dead, her soul has gone beyond the stars, but her memory lives.

The State of Illinois—always the home of great men—mindful of the fact that she is entitled to no more places in this hall, presents now to the nation the statue of this woman, cunningly carved, by a woman, out of the finest and the whitest of marble. [Long-continued applause.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Colorado owes much to Illinois. From her we derived our form of State constitution; from her also we took many of our statute laws; from her came many of the pioneers who helped to give form and shape to the State's new life; but no debt of Colorado to her mother State exceeds in importance that which she owes for the precious gift of memory of the life and character of Frances E. Willard. Herself one of the nation's empire builders, she appeals with peculiar force to the thousands of noble, constructive men and women who look to such examples for their guidance and for their support.

Miss Willard was unusually adapted to meet such needs. She had in her own life seen and been a part of the growth and development of two of our great Commonwealths. She had played a most important part in directing and ennobling the life of those communities before she entered upon her larger and more enduring labors. The men and women of Colorado who are trying to reproduce in the mountain surroundings of that State the ideas and ideals for which she gave her whole life's devotion find at every step abundant material in her history to serve as their own model and to her they look for leadership.

Her life has not been without its definite, tangible, present results in that State at least. Much that she labored for has there been achieved. Colorado is one of the four States of the Union which have accorded to woman full civic rights, which recognize in fullest measure her equality before the law, and place her on a plane in all respects equal to that occupied by her brothers. It has been a successful experiment, and the people everywhere give it a full measure of approval. In every line of civic activities that community has received and has appreciated the benefit of woman's counsels, help, and active constructive work; and these counsels and that help have had a most stimulating effect in every phase of life.

In none of Colorado's institutions for higher education, save the technical school of mining engineering, is any line of sex distinction drawn. Yearly these institutions are not only more and more adding distinction and bringing honor to our State, but they are approaching more and more the ideals of the woman who was not only a great reformer, philanthropist, and religious worker, but a great, positive force in the educational world.

Of the six Members of this House who have been sent here in part by women's votes, three are from the Centennial State. It is therefore proper that I should, on behalf of that State and its noble women, add my voice to the volume of tribute to the life of her whose statue now holds this highly honored position.

In her life she graced and adorned every circle. She added strength and force to every council. She promoted and advanced every good cause to a degree that we do not yet fully appreciate. Others have recounted in glowing terms the features of her life, and have told what she did for civilization and humanity. I do not care to attempt to add anything to what has been said along these lines. Miss Willard stands now as a type of the loftiest endeavor of the later years of the nineteenth century. Such a life and such a work knows no sex. It is for mankind.

To-day the nation joins in welcoming this newest addition to our Hall of Fame. It recognizes and pays glad tribute to her intellectual ability, her self-sacrificing work for her race, and the grandeur of her moral worth. It takes her into full fellowship with her heroes of war and peace, her great lawmakers and administrators, as one of those who have done great things for their native land.

The State whose advent into the sisterhood of States marked the opening of the second century of the nation's life can not and will not be unheard among those who at this time are giving utterance to the universal regard for her who is the cause and occasion of these exercises. Not only here, but in the lives and homes of her people she will perpetuate and cherish her memory and strive to emulate and follow her example.

Illinois, the home of her mature life and the scene of her greatest work, has given her an undying fame in the beautiful marble which now graces our halls. The nation has accepted the gift of that marble to cherish and protect. It is for Colorado, with the other States, to secure for her a monument more lasting than bronze, which is to be erected in the loving hearts of the thousands whose lives she has ennobled and uplifted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANN). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting recommendations in reference to appropriations to meet the expenses of collecting the revenue—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office relating to the adjustment of railroad land grants—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of reappropriation for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Corporations—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Director of the Mint submitting an estimate of appropriation for machinery at the Denver mint—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Postmaster-General submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for miscellaneous articles—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, trans-

mitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Andrew Crouch, Newton Crouch, and B. L. Butcher, executors of estate of Jacob Crouch, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 214) for extension of time of Washington and Gettysburg Railway Company, of Maryland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4632); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BABCOCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4938) regulating the use of telegraph wires in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4633); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18975) to authorize the levying of certain special assessments, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4634); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEEDHAM, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3376) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire for the Government, by exchanges of public lands, the ownership of the private lands within certain public parks in the State of California, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4635); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILLET of New York, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 168) determining the material of the public building of Cleveland, Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4636); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4838) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4637); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1635) for the extension of M street east of Bladensburg road, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4638); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 815) to correct the military record of James Houselman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4628); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2560) for the relief of G. G. Martin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4629); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3043) for the relief of the estate of the late John Jacoby reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4630); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUCKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15021) for the relief of Gilbert Shaw, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4631); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Accounts was discharged from the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 501) to pay Butler B. Hare \$223.33 for services rendered and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 19026) permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River near the village of Bemidji, Beltrami County, Minn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 19027) to amend an act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes, and for other purposes, approved March 2, 1893, as amended April 1, 1896, and March 2, 1903—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 19028) for the relief of the Alaska Central Railway Company—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 19029) to regulate the construction of dams over navigable waters—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 19030) to authorize the development of water powers in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 219) for the publication of eulogies delivered in Congress on John W. Cranford, late a Representative in Congress—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A resolution (H. Res. 505) providing for the consideration of H. R. 18973—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A resolution (H. Res. 506) providing for the consideration of H. R. 7298 and H. R. 17932—to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19031) for the relief of Henry S. Hannis & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19032) for the relief of Nathan Van Bell and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 19033) granting an increase of pension to David Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 19034) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Weese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 19035) for the relief of the heirs of W. R. Poole—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 19036) for the relief of Bert E. Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 19037) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Shoddon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 19038) granting an increase of pension to A. B. Washburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19039) granting a pension to Rosetta J. Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 19040) granting an increase of pension to Michael McManus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 19041) for the relief of the trustees of Lebanon Union Church, of Lincolnia, Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.



Also, a bill (H. R. 19042) for the relief of the vestry of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Haymarket, Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 19043) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 19044) granting an increase of pension to John A. Greenlaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19045) granting a pension to James L. Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, for a law prohibiting dealing in options—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, thanking the President and those who voted for the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of the agent of the tobacco planters, manufacturers, and laborers in the Philippines, asking a modification of Dingley tariff law on products from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Palmyra (Me.) Grange, against repeal or change of the Grout oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Petition of V. S. Whisler, of Killbuck, Ohio, against religious legislation for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Alvord Tex., against religious legislation for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DENNY: Petition of representatives of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, against permitting the sale of intoxicating liquor in Indian Territory after it becomes a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of 370 citizens of Maryland, favoring the Senate amendment to the statehood bill to prohibit selling of liquor in the Indian Territory after it becomes a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Division No. 87, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Troy, N. Y., against passage of the Townsend-Esch bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, against ill-advised legislation relative to freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, against trading in options—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Camp No. 421, of Schellburg, Bedford County, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Mason, Ill., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the representatives of the tobacco planters, manufacturers, and laborers in the Philippines, asking a reduction of the Dingley tariff on Philippine products imported into the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of citizens of Allamakee County, Iowa, against religious legislation for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAMES: Resolution of the Kentucky legislature, asking an appropriation for the improvement for the Pond River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of the Federation of Labor of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, against the reduction of the tariff on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIND: Petition of Paul A. Dahl and numerous other citizens of Minnesota, praying that the provisions of the act of Congress of February 20, 1904, authorizing the sale and entry of certain lands on the Chippewa Reservation be amended so as to authorize final proof at the end of fourteen months and upon payment of \$200, irrespective of the amount due—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of 87 citizens of Dixfield, Me., against repeal of the Grout oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 85 citizens of Dixfield, Me., favoring a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MACON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Michael McManus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 494, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Port Royal, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MINOR: Petition of citizens of Wisconsin, against religious legislation for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of the Middletown Machine Company, favoring bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Dayton (Ohio) Manufacturing Company, favoring bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Germantown, Ohio, asking concurrence of the House with the Senate temperance clause in the statehood bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Swin Valley (Ohio) Grange, No. 657, favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Okeana (Ohio) Epworth League, against the seating of REED SMOOR, and favoring laws to prevent seating of any Mormon in House or Senate of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 64 citizens of Elgin, 65 citizens of Academia, 21 citizens of Finley, 66 citizens of Greenwich, 67 citizens of Akron, and 64 citizens of East Liverpool, all in Ohio, against religious legislation for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Dayton, Ohio, asking Congressional influence in favor of universal and perpetual peace—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Jackson Grange, No. 403, of Farmersville, Ohio, favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the board of directors of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, relative to transportation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, opposing the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., for legislation preventing dealing in options—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of citizens of Waldo, Kans., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the vestry of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Haymarket, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: Petition of Division No. 442, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Jonesboro, Ark., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Division No. 332, Order of Railway Conductors, of Jonesboro, Ark., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODEY: Petition of citizens of San Juan County, N. Mex., against religious legislation for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of constituent of Mr. RODEY, of Silver City, N. Mex., against reduction of the tariff on cigars and tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Socorro County, N. Mex., asking concurrence of the House in the Senate amendments to the statehood bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolution of the National Business League, for repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the Hill Brass Company et al., favoring free alcohol in the arts and manufactures—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Resolution of the National Business League, asking for repeal of the desert-land law, the commutation clause of the homestead law, and the timber and stone law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution of the National Board of Trade, relative to forestry and irrigation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the representatives of the Philippine tobacco industry, asking free entry of their products into the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of citizens of Jackson, Mich., against religious legislation for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.